FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 109 *6 June 1983*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

AFP: Arrival of Soviet Arms Negotiator Delayed AA 1
'One-Sided' American Proposals at Geneva Scored AA 1
[Bovin in IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]
USSR 'Will Not Allow Parity To Be Upset' AA 3
[Soltan]
IZVESTIYA Observer on Western Protest Movement AA 3
[Kondrashov, 29 May]
Journal Sees 'Awakening' in W. Europe on Missiles AA 5
U.S. Strategic Forces Commission's Life Extended AA 6

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Missiles Issue Examined at Budapest Forum BB 1
[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Belyayev, Gerasimov, Sobolev]
Children, World Threats CC 1
Williamsburg Reviewed CC 2
U.S. Soviet Relations on Peace CC 3
Israeli 'Aggressive' Wars CC 5
U.S. Deployment in Turkey, Israel CC 7
New U.S. 'Team' in C. America CC 8
'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 9
[Anikin, Shishkin, Polesin, Semenov]
Soviet Statement, U.S. Reaction CC 9
Reagan Policies CC 11
Burma's Anniversary CC 11
Bovin Criticizes Williamsburg Summit Outcome CC 12
UN Disarmament Commission Talks Blocked by U.S. CC 13

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Soviet-Canadian Economic Group Meets in Moscow A 1
Session Begins Work A 1
Delegation Heads Interviewed A 1
Cooperation Agreement Signed A 2

Canada's Regan Meets Separately With USSR Officials A 3
Discussion With Patolichev A 3
Baybakov Meets Regan A 3
Gorbachev Receives Regan A 3
'Actions, Not Words' Measure of U.S. Sincerity [Olin] A 3
Moscow English on Programming to N. America A 4

CHINA

IZVESTIYA Views U.S.-PRC Trade Developments [5 Jun] B 1
African National Congress' Tambo Meets Zhao B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japan Viewed as 'Nuclear Staging Area' C 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA]
Nakasone Support for U.S. Nuclear Policy Hit C 1
[Chekhonin]
IZVESTIYA on Nakasone's Missiles Stance [3 Jun] C 2
Nakasone Effort To Join Japan With NATO Rapped C 3
[Afonin]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Australian-USSR Relations 'Mutually Beneficial' E 1
Pol Pot Gangs Make Arms Plentiful in Thailand E 1
[PRAVDA 31 May]
PRAVDA Cites Denial of Kampuchean Reinforcement [31 May] E 2
Vietnamese Army Corps Withdraws From Kampuchea E 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Weinberger's West Europe Tour Draws Criticism G 1
Weinberger in Norway for Talks, Four-Day Tour G 2
Arrival Noted G 2
Visit 'Patently Militaristic' [Kornilov] G 2
Press Conference Remarks Attacked [Magari] G 3
Norway 'Under Pressure' G 4
Finland's Koivisto To Visit Soviet Union 6 June G 4
Finnish Leaders Interviewed G 4
Visit Previewed G 5
Relation's History Recapped [Kalyagin] G 6
Baden-Wurttemberg Premier's USSR Visit Continues G 7
FRG Embassy Hosts Luncheon G 7
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 May]
Holds Press Conference [PRAVDA 2 Jun] G 7
FRG's SPD Press Conference on Missiles Viewed G 7
French Debate on Williamsburg, Missiles Cited G 8
[Magari]
CPSU Delegation Returns Home From Sweden G 9
[PRAVDA 29 May]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Fatah Delegation Meets Soviet Officials H 1
USSR, Algeria Hold Political Consultations H 1
Analyst Notes U.S. Military Plans in Lebanon H 1
[Shabayev]
U.S., Israeli Anti-Syrian Stance Criticized H 2
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Jun]
IZVESTIYA's Geyvandov Hits U.S. Mideast Policy [3 Jun] H 3
Libyan, Soviet Friendship Societies Sign Agreement [JANA] H 5

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Development of Chemical Weapons by RSA Alleged J 1
U.S. Experts Aiding RSA [Kalyagin] J 1
UN Resolution on Namibian Independence Adopted J 1
RSA 'Ignores' Resolution J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Reagan Said 'Toughening' Central American Policy K 1
U.S. Latin American Ambassador Shuffle Scored K 1
[Teplov]
IZVESTIYA Berates Goldwater's Cuban Remarks K 3
[Ganshin, 31 May]
U.S. To Send Green Berets to Honduras K 3
Briefs: Cuban Delegation K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Kirghiz Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported R 1
[SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA 21 May]
Briefs: Turkmenistan Restoration Work R 2

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Chemical Industry Minister Responds to Criticism S 1
[PRAVDA 26 May]
Civil Aviation Conference Held in Alma-Ata S 2
[IZVESTIYA 25 May]
TV Tower 380 m High Erected in Tashkent S 2
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 22 May]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Harvesting Conditions, Operations Reviewed T 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Jun]
IZVESTIYA Editorial on Harvesting Preparations [29 May] T 2
Agricultural Machinery Needs Servicing, Spares T 4
Moscow TV on Rural Management, Nature Protection T 5

AFP: ARRIVAL OF SOVIET ARMS NEGOTIATOR DELAYED

NC051942 Paris AFP in English 1853 GMT 5 Jun 83

[Text] Geneva, June 5 (AFP) -- The arrival here of Victor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation to the U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (START), has been delayed, Soviet sources said today without specifying the reason.

Mr Karpov would arrive "in a few days," and his deputy Aleksey Obukhov would replace him until then, a Soviet spokesman said.

The talks, which began on June 29 last year and were suspended for consultations last March 31, are due to reopen Wednesday.

The start talks are being held in conjunction with the Euromissile talks that opened in November 1981.

'ONE-SIDED' AMERICAN PROPOSALS AT GENEVA SCORED

PM060816 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin article under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion": "A Reasonable Approach Needed"]

[Text] The latest round of strategic arms limitation and reduction talks begins in Geneva next week. It is probably no exaggeration to say that the problem being resolved at these talks is the No 1 problem in world politics. After all, retarding the nuclear missile arms race and reversing it is the main way -- the only realistic way -- to revive detente and lessen the threat of war.

Unfortunately it must be noted that earlier rounds have brought no tangible results. In principle, such a result can only be a compromise -- that is, a mutually acceptable solution taking account to an equal degree of the two sides' security and legitimate interests. In order to move forward together, each participant in the talks must yield and retreat in some respect. Herein lies the essence of reasonable compromise. Herein, too, the essence of a reasonable approach to talks.

And so, the proposals which Washington has put forward and which, it insists, have nothing in common with such an approach. I will remind readers that the strategic nuclear forces of the USSR and the United States have very different structures. Seventy percent of the USSR's strategic potential (calculating in warheads) consists of ground-based ICBM's, while more than 80 percent of the U.S. potential consists of SLBM's and heavy bombers. What do the Americans propose? They propose reducing strategic weapons in such a way that the Soviet Union would have to dismantle more than 90 percent of its ICBM's, which form the basis of our country's strategic defense might.

The one-sided, unbalanced nature of the American proposal is no secret. "The Americans do not conceal the fact," the KOELNER STADT-ANZEIGER wrote, for instance, "that for them it is, above all, a question of reducing the number of those Soviet missiles which are, in their opinion, the most dangerous." The U.S. President's proposal, the weekly TIME summed up, "is so clearly advantageous to the United States that it raises, above all, the question of the realism and even the sincerity of the Reagan administration's approach to establishing arms control." And finally, one more opinion.

"If our proposal," former Vice President Mondale stated, "is concentrated on reducing those weapons which the Russians have and which alarm us, and not those weapons which we have and which alarm them, then that proposal will be unrealistic." So it has turned out. But trying to strengthen U.S. security at the expense of lessening the USSR's security means, from the first, undermining any possibility of mutually acceptable solutions.

...It was long, long ago. In the late twenties. The then Chancellor of the Exchequer W. Churchill delivered a speech which became known as "The Disarmament Fable." Here is what he said: "Once upon a time all the animals in the zoo decided to disarm, and organized a conference to carry it out. Opening the conference, the rhinoceros stated that the use of teeth is a barbarity which should be strictly prohibited; horns, however, which are basically a defensive weapon must, of course, be permitted."

I am sure the White House has never even heard of Churchill's fable. But one forms the impression that it is the logic of the rhinoceros which forms the basis of the American stance.

The moral of the fable told by Churchill is simple: "horns" and "teeth" must be considered simultaneously. And we have to agree with this moral, regardless of the specific concerns which agitated the British politician. Only the joint examination of all types of strategic arms and the consideration of all factors determining the strategic situation will make it possible to feel our way to a compromise solution which suits both the USSR and the United States. In accordance with this approach, the Soviet Union has proposed a reduction by stages in the total quantity of launching installations on the ground and on submarines and of heavy bombers to 1,800 units on each side by 1990. The number of nuclear warheads on these delivery vehicles would also be reduced to equal, agreed levels.

But the Americans are stubborn. They are stubborn because they are quite unable to give up the hope of twisting us around their little finger and obtaining military-strategic superiority. The ambivalent, unconstructive nature of their line is emphasized by the decision to deploy 100 MX missiles, each with 10 warheads. The U.S. President is trying to convince the public that the MX missiles are intended to help the success of the talks. And some people have swallowed the bait. But by no means everyone. "The MX missiles" -- I quote the NEW YORK TIMES -- "were advertised to Congress as a means of achieving success at nuclear arms control talks. That is nothing more than the desire to pass off wishes as reality. This is pernicious self-deception." That is what the specialists P. Warnke and A. (Sherr), well known in this field, believe. And they are certainly right.

Much has been written in the American press recently to the effect that, under pressure from the Congress, the White House intends to modify its stance at the Geneva talks. It is reported that on the eve of the commencement of the talks, the President is to assemble the National Security Council, which will propose several options for such modifications. Their general thrust accords with the recommendations of the Scowcroft Commission -- shifting the emphasis from the number of missiles to the number of warheads and the throwweight.

In such a complex matter as the START talks, there can be many options. But only those which proceed on the basis of parity, equality and identical security of the sides have any chance of success.

USSR 'WILL NOT ALLOW PARITY TO BE UPSET'

LD042002 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 4 Jun 83

[Text] As the Soviet Government warned the United States and the other NATO countries in its statement of May 28th, it will take countermeasures if no agreement has been reached on nuclear arms limitation in Europe that would exclude the deployment of new American missiles there. Our news analyst Yuriy Soltan makes the following remarks:

The Soviet Union has taken a stand of principle on matters of nuclear disarmament. It is against military rivalry with anyone. A new round of the nuclear arms race would enhance the risk of a nuclear war. It would hamper, if not rule out altogether, any settlement of disarmament problems. But the Soviet Union cannot ignore the threat to its security and the security of its allies. The United States has developed, produced and deployed new ground, sea and airbased strategic arms, and this made it necessary for the Soviet Union to deploy new strategic systems accordingly. In much the same manner the Soviet Union will have to strengthen its defense capabilities if first-strike American nuclear arms are stationed in Western Europe.

At a conference of NATO war ministers the other day, the United States confirmed its intention to do so and brought pressure to bear on its allies to support the plan. The new American missiles, capable of hitting targets deep inside Soviet territory, are meant as a direct addition to the U.S. strategic nuclear potential in order to change the existing regional and global military balance in favor of the West.

The Soviet Union will not allow the parity to be upset. As the Soviet Government declared, the basing of American missiles in Europe would compel the Soviet Union to reconsider its decision of last year concerning a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range systems in the European zone. Moreover, there would be a need for deploying additional systems in agreement with the Soviet Union's Warsaw Treaty allies so as to create the necessary counterbalance to the growing group of American forward-based nuclear systems in Europe and the nuclear arms of other NATO countries. And besides, it will be necessary to take countermeasures with a view to American territory proper. The Soviet side has warned about this more than once. This is no threat or nuclear blackmail, a method favored by the Reagan administration. The Soviet measures are countermeasures. The need for them is dictated by the turn of the situation. Their sole aim is to prevent any change in the existing balance of force. But even as the Soviet Government announced these forced measures, it declared that its principled approach to the problem of nuclear disarmament has not changed. The Soviet Union will continue doing everything in its power to bring about a radical reduction of strategic arsenals and cuts in nuclear arms in Europe on a principle of equality and equal security. It does not want to have more nuclear arms in Europe than the NATO countries have, not by a single missile, medium-range plane or nuclear charge.

IZVESTIYA OBSERVER ON WESTERN PROTEST MOVEMENT

PM031357 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Stanislav Kondrashov commentary under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion:" "It Is Necessary To Act"]

[Text] The last shot on a battlefield on American soil was fired in 1865 -- from a musket.

Is this 120-year-old piece of news suitable to start a commentary on a current international topic? Yes, entirely, if the topic is the Americans' attitude to war, and war and the American national memory.

The United States has, in the postwar period alone, more than 200 times interferred or threatened to interfere by means of arms in the affairs of other countries, while no hostilities have occurred on its own soil for 120 years. Its memory does not bleed, does not issue warnings, like ours, like the memory of the other Europeans. Let us also recall that during World War II the United States had 50 times fewer people killed than the Soviet Union. This is one of the historical circumstances (and a very important one) which explain why the Americans listen to their militarists and, at times, heed them.

On the other hand, war has come closer to the American shores in the nuclear missile age and the fact that, even behind two oceans, you cannot just sit it out has entered the national consciousness for the first time. Old wounds are not smarting, but the spectrum of a nuclear catastrophe is not receding. This is how, 20 years ago, Republican Senator Everett Dirksen, well-known in his time, explained his support for the nuclear test ban treaty: "I would not like my tombstone to bear the epitaph: 'He knew what happened in Hiroshima, but did not take the first step.'"

There is no such inscription on the late Senator's grave. After the first step, many steps were taken along the road of detente in the seventies. Alas, the hopes have been replaced by the unprecedented anxieties of the eighties, and the nuclear Hydra, threateningly towering over mankind, is growing more and more heads, or rather warheads. Americans are being overcome by thoughts identical with Senator Dirksen's thoughts. We know about this from newspapers and we see it on our TV screens. An anthology "The American Threat and the Protest of Millions" recently published by the "Progress" publishing house confirms it specifically, in concentrated form, with a solid mass of evidence.

The staff of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute who compiled the anthology have done a useful job which, it is hoped, will be appreciated by our reader. The anthology comprises articles and excerpts from books by dozens of prominent citizens of the transatlantic power: ministers and senators, ambassadors and scientists, the military, journalists, and so forth. Secretaries of State Vance and Rusk are not part of the present cabinet, nor is Defense Secretary McNamara. Kennan and Toon, U.S. Ambassadors in Moscow, have retired -- one a long time ago, the other relatively recently. But that does not deprive them of the knowledge and experience in statesmanship which they have accumulated. And their reflections and warnings carry weight. They have spoken up because they cannot remain silent in the face of the irresponsible policy of the current administration which is sharply intensifying the threat of nuclear war.

Reading the anthology, you hear again the troubled voices from across the ocean. Many of them are familiar, they have been heard before, too, but in isolation. Gathered together, they create the impression of a powerful chorus, singing, though slightly out of unision, the same tune and on the same impulse -- to save the home we share, the earth. To spare the earth the possible fate of a "planet of insects and grasses" after a thirdworld war, a planet where nuclear holocausts wipe out the most developed and therefore most vulnerable higher forms of life. Publicist Jonathan Schell writes about such a planet in his popular book "The Fate of the Earth" (an excerpt is published in the anthology) which has played its part in awakening the Americans' antiwar sentiments. Kurt Vonnegut, the writer, has the same idea: "If we devastate the planet, nature can nevertheless restore life on it, only it will take several million years -- a mere trifle for nature. It is only mankind's time that is running out...".

Only mankind's.... Mankind -- what a boundless concept. But in its fundamental sense, mankind consists of parents and children, and two ineradicable instincts have kept it going through the depths of the centuries -- the self-preservation instinct of each being and the instinct of the preservation of the species. Notwithstanding the complex picture of the modern world, these two principles are part of "global thinking" concerned for the future of people and of modern civilization. Notwithstanding the motley nature of the American antiwar movement, the concern of fathers and children is helping to unite it. Paul Warnke, who at one time headed the U.S. delegation at the talks with the USSR on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, coped with the complexity and motley nature when he simply, and I think wisely, explained the reasons for the antinuclear protest by millions to the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL: "Young people today are not confident that they will be allowed to live to the age of their fathers and grandfathers."

What stands in the way? Alas, other principles, and they, too, are not easy to eradicate. They stem from the history of the United States and have been strengthened by the capitalist way of life. It is imperialism and chauvinism which place America by all but "divine" right above other states and peoples. Progressive Americans, including an increasing number of religious figures, do not recognize and hold up to ridicule this nonexistent right. However, the ideology of the political crusaders, backed up by the material weight of the military-industrial complex, is resulting in a particularly dangerous variety of miltarism. Arrogant ignorance deprives it of circumspection. This is confirmed by the stubbornness with which the current U.S. Administration is seeking to obtain unilateral military advantages over the Soviet Union, knowing in advance that our country will never tolerate the disruption of the established balance of forces and will be forced to adopt indispensable countermeasures to safeguard its own security. At present, it is not yet too late to halt the dangerous exacerbation of the situation, which is what the USSR is calling for, proposing a range of constructive measures to contain the arms race.

...Real events have outstripped the publishing house schedules. The antiwar movement has grown in scope and depth during the period not covered by the anthology and has scored a number of appreciable successes. President Reagan is increasingly frequently forced to fend off critics with words about the desire for peace and arms control. Maneuvering under the onslaught of the political opposition, he nonetheless remains true to himself on the central question, forcing the program for gigantic military preparations through Congress by hook or by crook. In order to halt U.S. militarism, the protesting millions must not rest satisfied with what they have achieved. What has been achieved has not yet resolved the matter in favor of peace and against war. It is necessary to act before it is too late.

JOURNAL SEES 'AWAKENING' IN W. EUROPE ON MISSILES

LD032207 Moscow TASS in English 2155 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- The idea is increasingly getting hold of the minds of West European politicians that not a single nuclear warhead -- either in Britain, France or West Germany, irrespective of its origin -- U.S., British or French -- should be left out of count in the balance of the European peace. Only parity and equal security of the sides -- at the lowest possible level, preferably -- meets the interests of the peoples of the continent, Nikolay Polyanov writes in an article headlined "The European Hostages of Washington". The article is published in the sixth issue of the journal MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS).

A year or two ago, the journal goes on, this simple truth was winning its way with difficulty. The Americans new have to make more and more efforts in an attempt to impose their will upon the West Europeans. The West Europeans' consciousnes_ is awakening slowly but surely, particularly in those countries over which the Damocles' sword of the nuclear arms race hangs more and more obviously. Many West European politicians see already today that on the other side of the Atlantic, in a contemplated nuclear patience [as received], concern is shown not for Europe, but for military advantages for the United States itself.

Exposing the hypocrisy of Washington figures, the author emphasizes that U.S. diplomacy does not need any progress at the Geneva talks. U.S. diplomacy reasons like this: Let the very fact of the conduct of the Geneva negotiations soothe the West European and world public. Let the Soviet Union think that mutually acceptable decisions will be achieved during an exchange of views with the United States. Weeks and months will fly by and at the end of the year "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles, as if by chance, will appear on the West European launching sites.

The point is, however, the article goes on, that Europe does not wish in any way to become a dumb goat which is destined for immolation. Today more and more Europeans ask: Has America conceived an intention, having hid itself behind its defensive rampart, to sacrifice Europe to an atomic war? Well, the question is quite warranted and burning for the Europeans. They have long ceased viewing America as a rich uncle across the ocean from whom one can learn something and can get something. The aspect of the uncle appears before them in quite a different light today. It is visualized in a smoke-clouded glow, and reminds one that nowadays it is necessary to make every effort for the glow never to rise over the old continent and the whole world, the article stresses in conclusion.

U.S. STRATEGIC FORCES COMMISSION'S LIFE EXTENDED

LD041141 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 4 Jun 83

[Text] Washington June 4 TASS -- President Reagan's decision to extend till January 1, 1985 the activity of the commission on U.S. strategic forces, he set up early this year, is viewed here as another evidence of the White House's intention to continue the adventurous course towards escalating the arms race. According to the newspaper WASHINGTON POST, there are plans to retain the commission in the far remote future as well. The main task of that body, headed by Brent Scowcroft, former assistant to the president for national security affairs, and comprising such frank "hawks" as former U.S. Defence Secretaries Laird, Rumsfeld and Schlesinger, was to work out a large-scale programme of deploying intercontinental ballistic missiles MX. The commission fully justified the White House's hopes, observers point out, for it not only came out with an MX basing method, but also offered to develop a new nuclear missile, Midgetman. That is why the Reagan administration decided to use it in the future in the implementation of its militarist designs.

MISSILES ISSUE EXAMINED AT BUDAPEST FORUM

PM061325 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent S. Dardykin dispatch: "Parliamentarians' Responsibility"]

[Text] Budapest [no date given] -- Parliamentarians are meeting for the fifth time in 10 years to discuss questions of security and cooperation in Europe. And never before in these 10 years has such alarm at the dangerous situation in the world been heard in the delegates' speeches as at this interparliamentary conference in Budapest.

Serious concern at the lack of positive progress at the Geneva talks was voiced in the overwhelming majority of the speeches at the Fifth Interparliamentary Conference on Cooperation and Security in Europe. A whole number of speakers, including speakers from Western states, voiced sober and realistic views in connection with this most urgent problem of European politics. Thus, speaking of the stand taken by Britain and France, which do not wish their nuclear arsenal to be taken into account at the Geneva talks, Canadian delegate (A. Lourens) put a question dictated by elementary logic from the conference rostrum: "Why not, in fact, take their missiles into account in Geneva? Are they sacred -- these missiles -- or less dangerous because they are French or British?"

At the same time certain delegates from NATO countries once again tried to shift the blame for the arms race and the lack of progress at the Geneva talks onto the Soviet Union. They endeavored to depict events as though the indisputable fact does not exist that in all instances without exception of the development and deployment of new nuclear weapons systems the United States has been the initiator, while the USSR has found itself in the role of someone catching up. As though there has not been a number of far-reaching Soviet proposals.

Replying to these assertions which run counter to reality, L. N. Tolkunov, member of the Soviet delegation, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commission, and deputy chairman of the USSR Parliamentary Group, once again reminded the meeting participants of the substance of the USSR's proposals, including the important initiative advanced by Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 3 May this year. The Soviet Union has expressed readiness to reach agreement on the quality of nuclear potentials in Europe in terms of both delivery vehicles and warheads, while, of course, taking into account the corresponding arms of Britain and France. In that case approximate equality would be maintained between the USSR and NATO in terms of missiles and aircraft (carries of medium-range nuclear weapons) and in terms of the number of warheads on them, only at a considerably lower level. The realization of this proposal would result in there being considerably fewer missiles and warheads on them in the European part of the USSR than there were before 1976, when we did not have SS-20 missiles. The impression is created, I. Darvasi, representative of the Hungarian delegation, emphasized at the conference in this connection, that no one in the West has yet studied the Soviet proposals seriously. Otherwise, the Hungarian parliamentarian said, the agreement could already have been signed in Geneva.

After the end of the plenary sessions the conference participants are continuing to work in the commission.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD051738 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 5 Jun 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Igor Petrovich Belyayev, head of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Foreign Politics Department; Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, APN political observer; and Vitaliy Sergeyvich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Text] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades! First of all, I would like to tell you that both of my partners in our talk have just returned from working trips. Gennadiy Ivanovich has been in the United States and Igor Petrovich in the Near East, visiting Israel. I think that today we will hear about their impressions, not as tourists, of course, but as journalists. I expect we shall also touch upon European and Central American events. But to begin with, let us turn to a theme, the importance of which none of us doubt and which is suggested for us by International Children's Day, marked this week.

Children, World Threats

Protection of children is a broad concept. They have to be protected from disease, fed, and educated. But in our times they have to be protected, first and foremost, from the threat of war. This threat is already perceived by children themselves, as is to be seen from the letter to Comrade Andropov from the U.S. fifth grade schoolgirl Samantha Smith. Adult Americans -- I have in mind the legislative assembly of the state of Maine, Samantha's native state -- have adopted a very solemn document highly appraising both the schoolgirl's civic maturity and the Soviet leader's response, which has inspired hope for the preservation of peace.

Gennadiy Ivanovich, one would think we know enough about the United States, but it never ceases to amaze me. The attitude toward children, for instance. The country is rich, and a lot is done for children. For example, there is the famous Disnyland, a big park.

[Gerasimov] There are two of them, one in California, the other in Florida.

[Sobolev] Yes. Well, there they have brought to life characters from favorite fairy-tales and adventure books by the miracles of electronics. A lot of various toys have been invented in the United States. But at the same time, here is another example: As has been observed by Professor (Nikolayevskiy) and by Americans, in an ordinary shop in New York you can buy a children's game called "Torture." In it, dolls in masks squeeze the head of their vicitm in iron hoops, drive needles under his nails and sear his skin with hot irons. The instructions for the game say: All kinds of torture in eight sets. The parts from each set fit each other. Combine them and create your own tortures! Well, all right, it is a game. But take child pornography, child prostitution -- this is, after all, a whole field of business which has gained broad scope, with advertisements in the press and with obvious connivance from the authorities. Evidently, there are also plenty of customers, some sort of degenerates.

[Gerasimov] But it is a consumer society and in that society everything that can bring profit, even if it is filthy profit, is created.

[Belyayev] I would like, naturally, to call to mind the Near East. In this respect 6 June, that is tomorrow, is the first anniversary of Israel's war against Lebanon. It continues to this day. True, the most awful days are behind us. As it happens, it was in June, July and August, when fighting was in progress on the approaches to West Beirut, that Lebanon's children suffered probably more than any other category of the population. Palestinian children died from artillery shelling, from bombing.

Today I would stress the main thing: In this war, Israel made use of horrific weapons of mass destruction. I have in mind weapons such as vacuum boms, phosphorous bombs and shells, and cluster bombs. Since there was no mass concentration of troops on the Arab side, on the Lebanese side during the bombing, including that of West Beirut, it was primarily children that were the victims of these mass destruction weapons. When we say today that children must be protected fron the corrupt influence of the consumer society, it seems to me that we should also stress today the fact that children must be protected from imperialism, from all those who, like Israel and its current government headed by Begin, are trying to use wars to resolve political and other problems in the Near East region.

Williamsburg Reviewed

[Sobolev] Continuing our conversation about the recent events, we must, of course, turn to the meeting in Williamsburg, which has been continually commented on this week by the Western press. The commentaries differed to the utmost degree. For example, the semiofficial articles stress the accord of those taking part in the meeting, but then, let us say, papers such as the French LE MATIN or the West German SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG feel that no concrete results were achieved. Michael Foot, leader of the British Labour Party, even expressed himself thus: The Williamsburg conference is a catastrophe for the Western world.

[Gerasimov] I happened to be in the United States during the conference. There, of course, the Americans get their news primarily from television. This meeting in Williamsburg was planned first and foremost according to a television scenario. The little town itself, not far from Washington, is old, from colonial times and resembles an open-air museum. In general, a picturesque scene with luxurious decor was prepared. Horse teams were shown on television, cooks were shown and interviewed, and they explained what they would feed the distinguished guests in such detail that your mouth watered. In general and on the whole, the television viewer gained a very superficial impression of the meeting.

The serious press predicted various results. The meeting was intended primarily, of course, as an economic one. But these economic issues, as they say, took a back seat, and it was military-political issues that were at the fore. Complex themes such as budget deficits, bank interest rates, and other economic problems all somehow receded into the background.

[Sobolev] They caused big disagreements in Versailles. Since the organizers were tr ing to avoid disagreement this time, t'ey moved these issues into the background.

[Gerasimov] The disagreements remained, all the same, but in principle this was something like an annual medical examination, something like a prophylactic routine without any attempts to find the right course of treatment. The U.S. President made no promises, although he was asked to do something. There took place, so so speak, an exchange of already known opinions. Although they tried, the participants in the conference did not manage to move the United States from its stand. They did not manage to persuade it to review U.S. economic policy, which is having negative influence on the economies of the countries of Western Europe and Japan. Thus, here one can state that no particular changes took place.

In any case, the greater part of the time went not to discussions of complex economic problems but to composing a statement on missiles. Otto Lambsdorff, FRG minister of economics, for example, complained about this. He said that if the 30 million unemployed in the countries taking part in the conference are taken into account, then in comparison with economic policy, too much attention was paid to security policy.

It has to be said that the statement adopted, following 24 hours of disputes, was offered to the public as an answer to the Soviet Government's statement, a statement which contains the serious warning for the West that the Soviet Government, in response, will have to resort to measures to strengthen its defense capability if the West implements its planned program of upgrading arms. Incidentally, even before the publication of the Soviet statement, the U.S. WASHINGTON POST reported Reagan's intention -- and I quote -- to try to have a political declaration adopted in Williamsburg in support of siting a new generation of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe. So such a declaration was adopted. One can say that Reagan gained the upper hand here; it is a victory for his course regarding the Soviet Union. It talks about the planned deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe if accord is not reached in Geneva on some level of deployment and says nothing about the Soviet proposals. It can also probably be noted that the anti-Soviet front has widened.

The declaration carries Japan's signature too. Japan, as it were, is joining the NATO course. It is consulted and Japan, as it were, is entering into an unofficial alliance with the military bloc. France, which is not part of the NATO military organization, also joined in; after all, the subject of the statement is military.

In general, U.S. observer Joseph Kraft said that the Williamsburg conference may be the departure point for a coordinated approach to the Soviet Union.

U.S.-Soviet Relations on Peace

[Sobolev] Gennadiy Ivanovich, this question of missiles was discussed a few days later in Brussels, where the NATO countries' military ministers gathered, and it must be said that, all the same, there is no unanimity in Europe concerning these missiles, since, for example, the Danish Government has been instructed by its Parliament to try to have the deployment of these missiles deferred until the talks have finished. Holland has postponed the issue altogether for an indefinite period, and in Belgium itself, it seems to me, this issue has not yet been resolved.

[Gerasimov] Of course, there is a certain conflict of opinions in progress here, and you have correctly indicated the various positions on the issue, Vitaliy Sergeyevich, but I would say that the Reagan administration wants to go all out; it is trying for this deployment in every possible way, and it is already talking about deployment not as an accomplished fact but as a fact which will definitely be accomplished.

Incidentally, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has been in West Europe this week. In Brussels he said NATO now especially needs the missiles, and in Bonn he reasoned thus -- and it is not only him, Reagan also reasons in this manner -- that these missiles, their deployment, are needed in order to force the Russians to conduct talks seriously and to disarm. This is the theory of holding trump cards at the talks.

Well, this comes out almost like something from Arkadiy Raykin [Soviet comedian]. In one of his recent programs there was a sketch ridiculing the stand of one Western diplomat. This diplomat said: Before disarming one must rearm. Of course, the Americans are putting their missiles into Europe not to take them back again, but in order to gain additional strategic advantages in Europe.

[Sobolev] There are no fewer voices of another kind to be heard in America, and at quite a high level. I think we may now recall the reception of Harriman and his wife by Comrade Andropov this week. Both are prominent political figures in the United States and are in favor of a closer dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, in order that detente may be revived and disarmament achieved.

[Gerasimov] Harriman is, of course, well known in our country as well. He was U.S. ambassador in Moscow during the war, and he has been striving for a long time for normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations. In his talk with Harriman, Comrade Andropov expressed what would seem to be simple thoughts but one which contradicts current U.S. policy, namely that we have a common enemy, the threat of war, and that in these conditions mutual restraint is needed. The United States is currently conducting an exactly opposite policy. This does not mean, however, that the Reagan administration meets no opposition or criticism in its own country. Now I have just returned from a discussion in the American town of Minneapolis which was organized on the American side by the Institute of Political Research and on the Soviet side by the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies and the USSR-United States Society. Ours was quite a large delegation headed by Academician Nikolay Nikolayevich Blokhin. By coincidence, on the day the meeting opened THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper wrote about the very poor state of Soviet-American relations. This gave the participants at the meeting the opportunity to lay renewed stress on the importance of continuing the Soviet-American dialogue in such unfavorable conditions since this very low level was to the detriment of both countries.

The Washington administration, however, most likely believes something else. These are trivialities but indicative ones. It was clearly reluctant to grant visas to the Soviet participants at the meeting, issuing them at the very last minute, almost on the aircraft steps, while shortening the periods for which they were valid, refusing some visas, and refusing to extend the visit for those who had other affairs in other cities. Such an anti-visa policy is clearly aimed at further curtailing links. The administration is evidently afraid that -- as it thinks -- the representatives of evil -- for you see, we are evil to them -- who have on examination turned out to be normal and perhaps even nice people, might by merely appearing on the scene wreck the myth which is a cornerstone of their policy, Washington's big lie.

In contrast to Washington's lack of hospitality, the authorities in the city of Minneapolis and in the State of Minnesota itself gave a joyful reception to the Soviet delegation.

[Sobolev] It seems to me that they are afraid of giving visas not so much to Soviet people as to the Soviet peace initiatives, the Soviet proposals which make it possible to improve relations between our countries.

[Gerasimov] Yes, and to our simple arguments that our common enemy at this time is the threat of war. For instance, a quotation from a local U.S. newspaper, the ST PETERSBURG TIMES -- there is a town called St Petersburg named by a Russian engineer at the start of the last century in honor of the then St Petersburg -- was cited at this conference. This newspaper said that for the present generation of Americans, the Russians are a sort of dark mass reminiscent of the soldiers in the opposing trenches during the war. This is a most serious thing for our dangerous world, the newspaper said. The opponent is thus demonized, so to speak, and the most evil intentions are ascribed to him. Distrust of his declarations is spread. With such a big lie, the conditions are created for continuation of the arms race and an aggressive policy such as is being conducted by the administration at present.

[Sobolev] It seems to me, however, that however much U.S. and Western propaganda as a whole frightens the population, the majority of Americans and inhabitants of the West are, nevertheless, people of common sense. This is shown not only by the polls which are held there, by personal meetings such as those you had, but also by the many letters received. It is well-known that radio broadcasts go out from Moscow not only in Russian but also in dozens of foreign languages. Foreign listeners show a very ready response to these broadcasts by writing to Moscow Radio.

I should like to quote two letters here: One of them is from a listener in the United States, (Philip Johnson). He writes as follows:

It is incomprehensible that while a clear majority of the American people are in favor of an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on stopping the manufacture manufacture of nuclear weapons, the incumbent, U.S. President is trying to create a climate in the international arena which impedes the signing of such an agreement and makes it simply impossible.

A letter from a Greek listener, (Stavros Kalovrides), is also fairly typical. This is the opinion of a European. He writes: I approve of and welcome the decisions adopted in Prague by the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries because they deal with peace, detente and disarmament. I approve of and welcome them because they correspond to the interests not only of the Soviet Union but also of the United States, the interests of the peoples of Europe, and the interests of all of mankind. That is, (Stavros Kalovrides) writes, I know, as do other fellow countrymen of mine, that the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community are doing everything within their power to preserve peace on earth. A most convincing confirmation of the Soviet Union's aspiration for peace is the obligation it assumed unilaterally not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

[Gerasimov] Twenty years ago John Kennedy, the then President of the United States, delivered a speech at American University in Washington in which he said: We shall not overlook our differences of opinion but let us also turn our attention to our common interests and find ways to help us eliminate these differences of opinion. This was exactly the same approach to our relations as Comrade Andropov referred to in his talk with Harriman. Indeed, an American journalist, citing this Kennedy speech from a modern viewpoint, writes in TIME magazine: Point by point, with convincing logic and elegance, this old speech refutes Reagan's allegations that the ultimate evil resides in the Soviet Union and that prosperity can be attained only by increasing our arsenal. Unfortunately, however, the about-face toward reason which took place in Washington 20 years ago has been replaced in our time by an about-face toward ignorance. How many years have been lost and how many more will be lost before the United States returns, as it must, to the point it reached 20 years ago.

Israeli 'Aggressive' Wars

[Sobolev] Today, comrades, the world public is marking the international day of solidarity with the Arab peoples. The fact is that on this day in 1967 Israel unleashed an aggressive war against the Arab countries; and 1 year ago on almost the same day it began a new aggression in Lebanon. Thus, it transpires that the Israeli Zionists, like Napoleon and Hitler, for some reason choose the month of June to start their aggressions.

[Belyayev] It has become necessary for me, too, to underline that yet another war began in June 1982. Before dealing with the features of this war, however, I should like to return to a certain objective fact: Israel has been in existence for 35 years; it was founded on 15 May 1948. Since that time, it has been to war six times. Six wars in 35 years is a lot. Israel is the most belligerent state in the world. The first war was in 1948-49, the second in 1956, the third in 1967, the fourth in 1973, the fifth in March 1978 -- the invasion of Lebanon -- and finally the sixth war in June 1982 which in fact is still going on to this very day.

[Sobolev] Some territories were seized as a result of each war. These only whetted the appetite further to start fresh wars.

[Belyayev] Continuing your idea, one could stress that at present -- something that has struck us Soviet people who have recently visited Israel -- the first thing that attracted the attention of all seven of us was that in Israel, in Tel Aviv, West Jerusalem, Haifa and the other towns we visited people talked about war all the time.

This time they were talking about war against Syria. Furthermore, the question was posed in this way: What position would other countries adopt if Israel is forced to start a war in Syria? On wonders why.

[Sobolev] Because it is June, the month for war.

[Belyayev] Well, in the first place because it is June, and in the second place because Syria has strengthened its defense capacity by June 1983. If we turn to the chronological features, so to speak, of the period we are going through then the matter comes down to the following: there is another danger. Some political observers, including some in Israel, talk of the possibility of an Israeli attack on Jordan. That is, to put it briefly, the war in Lebanon is not only the sixth in number, but is evidently not the last, as a number of Israeli military and political leaders suppose. It seems to me that when talking about the war in Lebanon today one should stress that it is not only the longest war in the entire history of Israeli-Arab wars, it is also the most cruel war, pointlessly cruel at that.

I would remind you of the following facts: At the time when Israel attacked Lebanon on 6 June 1982, the balance of forces was 12 to 1, and I am not even speaking here of the fact that the national patriotic forces of Lebanon or the Palestinians did not have at their disposal any tanks, aircraft or navy, which were, so to speak, at the disposal of the Israeli generals. Nevertheless, not only did the military fist descend upon Lebanon, but it was indeed brought down upon that country with senseless brutality with the result that over 80 percent of the victims -- numbering tens of thousands of people killed, wounded, maimed or missing -- were in the main members of the peaceful civilian population. It is not fortuitous that even the Western press -- I have in mind the American, West European and Japanese press -- were all forced to condemn the methods and means that the Israeli aggressors used to this day are using in Lebanon.

[Gerasimov] This is not preventing the provision once again to Israel of the same murderous weaponry as far as the civilian population in concerned.

[Belyayev] In this regard the Pentagon is evidently pursuing its own specific goals. Lebanon has been transformed in effect, if you like, into an experimental ground for testing the latest types of weaponry. Vacuum bombs, cluster bombs and phosphorous shells were used there for the first time, and incidentally the doctors and the people who came to Lebanon from the most diverse countries of the world ran into a totally unfamiliar situation in which they were unable to give the necessary medical assistance to those who had been stricken by these weapons. There were burned and terribly maimed bodies. People were simply bleeding to death because there was no medicine to halt those frightful processes that were to be witnessed by these same doctors in this same Lebanon.

[Sobolev] Indeed, the textbooks of military field surgery are probably becoming outdated for them in parts.

[Gerasimov] As soon as there was an opportunity the U.S. generals hastened there to see the results of the action of the weapons that they had presented to the Zionists.

[Belyayev] Consequently, we are dealing here not simply with a new war and the latest war. In practice we are dealing with a diabolical undertaking in which the ruling circles of Israel and of the United States were involved on an equal footing. Indeed, it is not fortuitous that Moshe Arens, Israel's present defense minister, is saying that the United States knew about the preparations for the war in advance and gave its consent to the waging of the war.

In practice we can say today, that this too is not the first American Israeli war against the Arab countries and that we are dealing in practice with a large-scale Israeli-American action in the Near East which has not yet finished. Who will be next? I have already said that Syria is being referred to as the next.

[Sobolev] Excuse me, Igor Petrovich, but after all the United States -- President Reagan and other leading officials -- denied that they had give Israel permission for this aggression. We have here yet another example of a big lie on Washington's part.

[Gerasimov] And a small lie on Israel's part, because exactly at that time, in June last year, I was in New York and every morning and evening it was Moshe Arens, Moshe Arens all the time. At the time he was Israel's ambassador to Washington. I remember his first speech: He said that Israeli troops had gone in only to move the partisans back a few kilometers, 30 km I think.

[Belyayev] You were saying....

[Gerasimov interrupts] Then it became 45 km and later even more. He always gave an impression that nothing special was happening. Even then -- he is now minister of defense -- even then he was misleading the public.

U.S. Deployment in Turkey, Israel

[Belyayev] Gennadiy Ivanovich, I should like to add to what you were saying about missiles. The point here is that the main front connected with the installation of new missiles is indeed Western Europe, but now the following is being said: In the event of some European countries not agreeing to the installation of the missiles -- I do not know what will happen to the situation there specifically when one is speaking about November and December 1983 -- but there are already indications that the Pentagon is planning the installation of medium-range missiles on Turkish territory, and that is already the USSR's immediate border.

[Sobolev] Yes, and as was noted recently by the Turkish MILLIYET, the Turkish public is concerned about the mounting U.S. military presence in Turkey. The Pentagon and NATO are also planning to modernize 11 military aerodromes in the country's territory, and $1 billion have already been allocated for this purpose. Turkish observers state that the prospect is looming of the appearance on their country's soil of the interventionist Rapid Deployment Force, as it is called. NATO maneuvers on Turkish territory are assuming an unprecentedly large scale, as stated by NATO headquarters. All these plans are, of course, directly opposed to the national interests and security of this country that is our neighbor.

[Belyayev] Well, one should add to this the fact that in accordance with the agreement on strategic cooperation that has now been galvanized the United States is preparing to deploy on Israel's territory the neutron bomb, neutron weapons and, as if that were not enough, ultramodern artillery and other equipment.

That is to say in short, that the Near East is already being transformed in effect into an appendage of the European theater of military operations where the United States would like to operate first and foremost against the Soviet Union -- in this case from that Near Eastern area, that is, as they put it, located directly on the USSR's southern border. Naturally, for this reason the Soviet Union not only has been urging and is urging that Israel halt its aggression against Lebanon and that the threats against Syria cease but is also doing everything necessary to bring closer a just Near Eastern settlement with a solution to all the most acute problems of the region.

New U.S. 'Team' in C. America

[Sobolev] Well, comrades, today we also need to turn to the situation in another crisis area: Central America. An exacerbation of the crisis there has been shown not so much by events in the countries of Central America itself as the events concerning the area. The U.S. President has replaced several key figures in his administration who are in charge of the specific implementation of U.S. policy in the region. The assistant secretary of state for Latin American affairs and the ambassador to El Salvador have been replaced and it is reported that the ambassadors in Guatemala and Costa Rica will also be replaced. Finally, the post of special representative of the President in Central America has appeared.

The reshuffle of diplomatic staff has put people who are well-known for their adherence to a hardline policy into prominent positions. Take, for instance, Motley, the new assistant secretary of state, who is an ex-ambassador to Brazil, a former Air Force officer, and a dealer in real estate who is fond of barracks stories and of taking the bull by the horns, but who is not fond of diplomatic niceties.

[Gerasimov] If one is to continue with these outline portraits, then for instance there is Stone whom you were mentioning....

[Sobolev -- interrupting] Stone is the representative of the President in Central America.

[Gerasimov] He is a former senator, the initiator of an anti-Cuban campaign in the Senate, and a paid lobbyist of the Guatemalan dictatorship.

[Sobolev] Of course, those persons who have been replaced were not doves by any means, but even they do not suit the White House. At the same time those who have been sacked, serve as scapegoats for all the lack of success of U.S. policy in Central America, in particular for the fact that they were unable to get support for this policy in Congress and thus were unable to obtain additional funds for financing the dictatorships in their care.

Whether the new officials will be cleverer in the area of publicizing U.S. interference is not clear but it is evident that they have been entrusted on their merits with expanding the aggression. Stone, for instance, has now gone off to El Salvador, while at the same time 100 U.S. advisers have arrived in Honduras to train the troops of the Salvadoran regime at special bases there. In order to divert attention, Stone has been given the impossible task of persuading the rebels to take part in the coming so-called elections at the end of the year. One must say that elections in El Salvador are now being planned by Washington almost as frequently as punitive operations and they are being organized roughly to the same design.

The aim here is clear. It is so that the dictatorship appears to be people elected by the people. In addition the White House wants to substitute elections for the negotiations that could bring about a genuine solution of the conflict by political means.

Talks are favored not only by the patriots but also by the governments of many Latin American countries. In the past few days there was the latest meeting in Panama City of the foreign ministers of Central American states and also Venezuela, Mexico, Colombia, and Panama itself. These four countries have been attempting to find a possible way of settling the conflict in Central America.

Although the United States is taking measures to hamper negotiations, its new team will scarcely be able to alter the attitudes of the Latin Americans. The times when Washington was able to disregard their attitudes have passed once and for all. However, soon the White House might have to seek new candidates for the posts connected with Latin America which have already ruined more than one career.

Here, comrades, we come to the end of our program. Thank you for your attention. All the best!

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD031806 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 3 Jun 83

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Viktor Anikin, All-Union Radio foreign affairs commentator, with Gennadiy Shishkin, TASS political observer; Adolf Sergeyevich Polesin, international affairs journalist, and Konstantin Semenov, candidate of history]

Soviet Statement, U.S. Reaction

[Excerpts] [Anikin] The statement by the Soviet Government evaluating the course of the Reagan administration which is aimed at achieving military superiority over the USSR and the other socialist countries has aroused a great response throughout the world and particularly in Western Europe. It left no one indifferent. This is quite understandable for this important document concerns questions of vital importance for the people. (Yakov Tikhonovich Makarov) from Krasnodar and (Ugmedov) from Nalchik note this in their letters. Many of our listeners particularly stress the timeliness of this document. I shall ask TASS observer Gennadiy Arkadiyevich Shishkin to comment on the program's mail.

[Shishkin] Indeed, at a time when talks are under way in Geneva on questions of limiting and reducing strategic armaments and also of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, the White House together with the Pentagon is doing everything to sabotage their successful conclusion in order to begin deploying, under this pretext, new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles on the territory of Western Europe.

From commentaries even in the U.S. press and also from serious military research it is becoming increasingly evident that the United States regards these missiles as first strike weapons capable of paralyzing response measures. While imposing its new nuclear missiles on Western Europe, the Reagan administration asserts that they are a counterweight to the Soviet missiles which are known in the West as SS-20's. Soviet leaders have frequently convincingly shown the total insolvency of these invented arguments. Even some organs of the U.S. press have been forced to admit this now. Take, for example, the DAILY CALIFORNIAN published in San Francisco. A few days ago it stated frankly: Of course it is not a matter of the Soviet SS-20 missiles. The Soviet missiles are simply modernized variants of existing weapons and they are not part of a plan aimed at creating the potential for making a first strike. Even if they did not exist, the U.S. Government would still find some ways of deploying cruise missiles and Pershing II missiles.

[Anikin] Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, in Western Europe now an increasing number of responsible figures understand that in imposing its missiles the United States is virtually turning its NATO allies into hostages of its nuclear stragegy.

[Shishkin] This is increasingly the subject of thought in the capitals of West European states.

It is no coincidence that in an interview for THE WASHINGTON POST, former FRG Chancellor Schmidt stressed that he now doubts the seriousness of the actions of the Reagan administration at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva about arms control. We Europeans, stressed Schmidt, wish to cooperate with the USSR, particularly in the sphere of limiting armaments.

Taking account of the growth of such feelings, the Reagan administration literally sounded the alarm. At the economic summit conference of seven capitalist countries which took place in Williamsburg 28-30 May, the most urgent and top-ranking questions of the agenda were pushed aside. Reagan personally twisted the arms of the other participants in the conference in order to make them participate in the adventurist course of his administration on the question of the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe. At the conference table Reagan demanded that a so-called joint statement be adopted on this subject and that it be expressed in harsh tones. However, it was fully supported only by the British and Japanese prime ministers, Thatcher and Nakasone. French President Mitterrand and Italian Prime Minister Fanfani insisted that decisions first of all be adopted on economic questions and FRG Chancellor Kohl said that the statement should not be too negative. Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau insisted on a firm statement by the West in favor of disarmament as its main aim. In the end Reagan got what he wanted, even though he made a few concessions to soothe public opinion, by a demonstration for show purposes of the West's striving for disarmament and dialogue with the USSR.

However, in spite of such a turn in the international situation which is unfavorable for the cause of peace, the USSR nonetheless, feels that the struggle to prevent the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe must and can be continued with increasing activity. The statement of the Soviet Government is aimed just toward this. It once again clearly sets out the essence of the Soviet proposals aimed at a major [kardinalnoye] reduction in medium-range nuclear means in Europe on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security. The USSR proposes to carry out a reduction of such armaments so that it will have no more medium-range missiles and warheads for them than Britain and France. This will be considerably fewer carriers and warheads than the USSR had in Europe in 1976 when the modernization of Soviet missiles had not yet begun. The USSR does not claim one more medium-range aircraft or one airplane missile [aviatsionnyy baryad] more than the NATO countries will have.

At the same time, in its statement the Soviet Government warns with great clarity that the decision of the United States and NATO to begin deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe, if implemented, will oblige the USSR to review the decision which it adopted last year on a unilateral moratorium on the further deployment of medium-range missiles in the European zone. It would also be necessary to implement other measures in agreement with the other Warsaw Treaty member states for the deployment of additional means in order to create the necessary counterweight to the increased grouping of U.S. forward-based nuclear means in Europe and the nuclear armaments of other NATO countries. It would also be necessary, as has frequently been warned by the Soviet side, to undertake the essential measures in response, having in mind the territory of the United States itself.

The USSR feels, however, that it is still possible to reverse the dangerous development of events. The statement by the Soviet Government is dictated by precisely this striving. The Soviet proposals set out in it are based on the principle of equality and equal security and they find understanding among influential political circles in the West and among the broad strata of the population. People of good will throughout the world join in the appeal of the Soviet Government to all states to find a solution to the urgent tasks of limiting and reducing armaments, primarily nuclear weapons, and to return to the path of detente, both political and military.

Reagan Policies

[Anikin] Konstantin Ivanovich, some of our listeners are amazed that President Reagan, at his own discretion, has named this year the "Year of the Bible." Listeners Tulisova from Arkhangelsk Oblast and Muzhikova from Leningrad write about this. I would like to devote attention to her letter. Here is what she writes: There is a saying in the Bible: Unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. Is this not the essence of Reaganomics, the listener from Leningrad asks?

[Semenov] Reagan's policies, the Moral Majority and Schaeffer are phenomena of the same order. They express the exploitative systems' class hatred and the imperialist reaction to everything which threatens the right of the exploiters to take for themselves the results of others' labor. It is no coincidence that for Schaeffer and Reagan, humanism is a word of abuse. It is no coincidence that it is considered that Reagan's attack on the socialist world, which he called as you may remember the center of evil in the modern world, was inspired by Schaeffer's activity and was designed to please the Moral Majority.

Burma's Anniversary

[Anikin] Yet another letter. Dmitriy Tikhonovich Borisenko from the settlement of Przhevalskoye, Smolensk Oblast, expresses an interest in the course of progressive socio-economic transformation in Burma.

This country in Southeast Asia -- its full name is the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma -- marked the 35th anniversary of its independence at the beginning of January. Comrade Borisenko in his letter asks about socialist construction in Burma. But, comrades, one must say directly here that in spite of the official name of the country, it is still too early to talk of the construction of socialism. Perhaps it is more apt to talk of the creation of the prerequisites which are as yet national-democratic in nature.

Let us turn to recent history. In 1962, a Revolutionary Council came to power in Burma. Its program was the document "The Burmese Path to Socialism." This program has a socialist orientation, seeking to create the prerequisites for the further move to the construction of the foundations of socialism of which I have already spoken. Burma's Revolutionary Council set up in the country the Burmese Socialist Program party which is now a prestigious mass organization leading the movement along the path of progress. But nonetheless, one cannot say that the ideological base of this party is scientific socialism. Individual Marxist-Leninist themes are reflected in its program but it also contains religious, nationalist, and social democratic elements.

For a whole range of reasons of an economic and internal political nature, progressive transformations in Burma have moved at a slower rate than that desired by the country's leadership. I would like to talk about the internal political reasons. I mean, comrades, primarily the civil war which nationalist separatist groups have been waging against the central government since Burma gained independence. Of course, this diverts much effort and resources.

But let us return to the theme of the letter, that is, the transformations which are being implemented in Burma. In recent years progressive changes have become particularly substantial. The third 4-year plan has been successfully implemented. The country has gathered a record harvest of rice for several years in a row and this is the main export crop.

Burma's economy is getting out of the state of stagnation and this in turn has also allowed work to begin on solving social issues such as improving the sanitation in towns and heavily populated areas, developing the health care system restoring architectural monuments of the past, which are numerous in Burma. These are a few of the recent achievements.

In general, over the 2 decades that the Burmese Socialist Program Party has been in power, foreign banks and the property of Western monopolies have been nationalized. The state has established its control over the leading branches of the economy and limited the activity of private capital. The 20-year plan for the economic development of Burma which ends in 1994 gives the following control figures: by that year the share of the state sector in the Burmese economy should increase to 48 percent; that of cooperatives to 26 percent; and the share of the private sector should consequently drop to 26 percent. The fulfillment of this plan, as was stated at the party's fourth congress will be an important step on the path to ensuring the independent development of the country.

One must speak spearately about Burma's foreign policy. The Burmese Government proceeds from the need to establish equal and friendly relations with states with different political systems. Burma supports strengthening universal peace, ending the arms race, noninterference in the affairs of other states the development of relations of friendship and good-neighborliness among peoples.

Burma's all-round links with our country are developing successfully and fruitfully.

BOVIN CRITICIZES WILLIAMSBURG SUMMIT OUTCOME

LD041920 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jun 83

[From the VREMYA newscast; commentary by IZVESTIYA Political Observer Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The Williamsburg conference had one substantial feature that distinguishes it from previous meetings of the seven. If previously the leaders of the leading capitalist states met and discussed economic problems first and foremost, this time in America, no less attention was devoted to questions of a military-political nature, and moreover, for the first time since these meetings began, a special document on military-political questions was adopted. All the indications are that this statement was prepared and adopted on the initiative of the Americans who are striving to bind their partners more and more firmly to the White House's hard line of power politics. The statement is in its nature, a typical NATO document, but on it now stands the signature of Japan, which, as is known, is not a member of NATO.

What does this mean, politically speaking? It means that by supporting plans to deploy, in particular, U.S. missiles in Western Europe, the Nakasone government has once again demonstrated its striving and its willingness to follow in the wake of U.S. policy.

A torrent of comment was also evoked by France's signature. The point is that for a long time Paris objected quite firmly against turning these meetings of the seven into a sort of super-NATO, and against the extension of NATO operations into other regions. Now Mitterrand has capitulated. It is very interesting that a REUTERS correspondent sent the following report from Paris: Officials and diplomats accredited in Paris are saying that it is thought in France that President Reagan used cunning to make President Mitterrand approve this statement. That is what REUTERS reports, but it seems that not everything can be explained here by "cunning."

The nub of the matter lies in the continuing evolution of France's foreign policy, which unfortunately is departing even more from the tradition of General de Gaulle. It is no accident that next week, for the first time since 1966, when De Gaulle withdrew France from NATO's military organization, a session of the NATO council will be held in Paris.

On the whole, the Williamsburg statement will have a negative effect on the international atmosphere and on world affairs. The Williamsburg decision, stated Johannes Rau, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, leaves no hope for the success of the Geneva talks, since the documents of the meeting contain not one word about any western readiness to compromise. Without compromises there can be no successful negotiations. This is really so, and we have to state that American has still not matured enough to understand this elementary truth.

UN DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TALKS BLOCKED BY U.S.

LD041154 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0840 GMT 4 Jun 83

[Excerpts] New York, 4 Jun (TASS) -- The United States and its main partners in NATO have blocked the achievement of understandings on all the main points of the agenda of the Disarmament Commission, whose annual session has ended at the United Nations Headquarters. The commission's tasks include the elaboration of specific recommendations for the working organs which are conducting talks on disarmament.

The focal point in the session's program was occupied by problems of limiting the nuclear arms race. Specific proposals on this question were put forward in the working document prepared by the nonaligned countries. The socialist states made a constructive contribution to the discussion. The neutral states of West Europe also adopted a sensible position.

However, the NATO powers and primarily the United States set themselves a different task -- that of not allowing general recommendations to be adopted. With this aim they resorted to direct sabotage, putting forward on each proposal a multitude of reservations and all sorts of "preliminary conditions" which they knew to be unacceptable for the nonaligned and for the socialist states.

As was noted at the session, the tactics adopted by the U.S. delegation again confirm the correctness of the conclusion contained in the Soviet Government statement of 28 May: "At all talks directly or indirectly connected with curbing the arms race, the U.S. Administration conducts an unconstructive and obstructionist line. This applies to the behavior of the United States at the talks in Geneva, in Vienna, in Madrid and at other international forums."

The speech by U.S. delegate D. Adamson was couched in the spirit of confrontation and in essence did not contain anything new apart form the monotony of its attacks on the USSR which put ones teeth on edge.

The duty of all states, the USSR representative V.V. Shustov said, is to find a solution for the tasks of limiting and reducing armaments and primarily nuclear weapons and to return to the path of detente -- both political and military. To the bellicose course of rejecting detente and disarmament, the USSR counterposes a policy which is consistent and free from short-term flunctuations and which is in accord with the interests of the peace-loving peoples.

SOVIET-CANADIAN ECONOMIC GROUP MEETS IN MOSCOW

Session Begins Work

LD012135 Moscow TASS in English 1237 GMT 1 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS -- The third session of the Intergovernmental Soviet-Canadian Mixed Commission for Economic, Industrial, Scientific and Technical Cooperation has begun in Moscow today. This is the first meeting since 1978. Gerald Regan, minister of state (international trade), who leads the Canadian delegation, has pointed out that the talks have got to lead to a considerable development of trade between the two countries. He said Canada wants to get contracts for participation in large-scale projects and is capable of carrying them out with high quality and on time.

The Canadian delegation, consisting of about 30 persons, comprises representatives of various government departments and a large group of directors of major companies.

Vladimir Sushkov, the leader of the Soviet delegation, deputy minister of foreign trade, in his speech touched upon wide possibilities for the development of Soviet-Canadian trade and economic cooperation.

The Soviet Union could purchase in addition to grain the growing amounts of equipment for many industries, including that for the oil and gas and pulp and paper industries; it could draw on Canadian experience in the development of the deposits of the Barents Sea; could set up industrial cooperation in the manufacture of some types of equipment, including that on the basis of Soviet licences, for the joint sale of products on the markets of the Soviet Union, Canada, as well as third countries. A promising area for cooperation is agriculture, where wide cooperation in the output and processing of plant-breeding and livestock products is possible.

The leader of the Soviet delegation emphasized, however, that a further increase in import is not possible without a solution of the question of a considerable expansion of Soviet export to Canada. Concrete talks on that score are already under way. There is also an idea to build an auto assembly enterprise in Canada for the assembly of "Lada" cars out of Soviet-made parts and units. Soviet power equipment could be widely used in the realization of Canadian plans for the construction of hydropower stations. There also exist other numerous possibilities for the development of Soviet-Canadian trade on a balanced basis.

In recent years Soviet-Canadian goods turnover rapidly grew: 500 million roubles in 1979, 1,000 million rubles in 1980, 1,400 million rubles in 1981 and 1982. This growth was connected mainly with the increase in Soviet purchases of grain in excess of the minimum amounts provided for by the long-term trade agreement. As a result the Soviet Union has become on the whole the fourth biggest export market for Canada.

The Canadian delegation will stay in the Soviet Union till Sunday.

Delegation Heads Interviewed

LD021140 Moscow TASS in English 1125 GMT 2 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS -- A Canadian governmental commercial delegation visited Moscow for the time [as received] has come and there are opportunities for a substantial further widening of reciprocal trade, Canada's Minister of International Trade Gerald Regan told a TASS correspondent.

He is of the opinion that the results of the session of the Intergovernmental Soviet-Canadian Mixed Commission on Economic, Industrial, Scientific and Technical Cooperation that ended here today open new prospects.

Gerald Regan noted that the members of the Canadian delegation, businessmen, who arrived in Moscow are optimistic and see broad possibilities for the widening of mutually advantageous cooperation, particularly in the sphere of the oil and gas extracting industry, in agriculture, the timber industry and metallurgy. There are also good prospects for the increase of the export of Soviet goods to Canada.

Head of the Soviet delegation, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade Vladimir Sushkov, in a conversation with a TASS correspondent, expressed satisfaction over Canada's realistic stand. We have worked harmoniously and outlined interesting prospects for the development of mutually-advantageous relations, he said.

Canada is not only a supplier of grain, Vladimir Sushkov said. There are good opportunities for a sharp increase of reciprocal deliveries of machinery and equipment. Soviet organizations show interest in purchasing some Canadian equipment, in establishing commercial cooperation.

For the balancing of trade they suggested to increase the Soviet export sharply, and not only of staple export goods but also of new items, mainly equipment.

Thus, Soviet organizations will bid for contracts to supply equipment for hydropower stations under construction in Canada. Concrete measures are being planned to increase the sales of "Belarus" tractors that sell well in Canada, of the "Lada" passenger cars, machine tools, other equipment.

The commission that was not gathering for 4 years decided to hold sessions every year. An official report says that at the latest session the sides pointed with satisfaction to the progress achieved in the recent years in the commercial, economic, industrial, scientific and technical spheres, to the existence of favourable opportunities for further development of mutually advantageous cooperation.

The Canadian delegation met heads of a number of Soviet ministries and departments. Talks will be held in foreign trade associations. The delegation will leave by air for Leningrad on Friday.

Cooperation Agreement Signed

LD031651 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 3 Jun 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] The third session of the mixed Soviet-Canadian Commission on Economic, Industrial and Scientific-Technical Cooperation has ended in Moscow. As a result of the session a protocol was signed. This is what was said by Gerald Regan, minister of international trade of Canada, to our correspondent: [shots of protocol being signed, cutting to shots of Regan interview]

[Begin Regan recording in English with superimposed Russian translation] In my view the session that was held was very fruitful. It passed in a friendly atmosphere. During the session we noticed a whole series of fields for cooperation. Our countries have much in common. We are northern countries with a complicated climate. Both countries have rich natural resources, and I consider that we can cooperate in such fields as oil and gas extraction, mineral mining and also in agriculture. I think that the mutual exchange of experience will be useful, and I consider that there are great possibilities for developing cooperation.

CANADA'S REGAN MEETS SEPARATELY WITH USSR OFFICIALS

Discussion With Patolichev

LD021921 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 2 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS -- Nikolay Patolichev, minister of foreign trade of the USSR, had a meeting with Gerald Regan, Canada's minister of state for international trade, today. The two ministers discussed issues pertaining to the further expansion and deepening of Soviet-Canadian trade and economic cooperation.

Geoffrey Pearson, Canada's ambassador to the Soviet Union, was present at the meeting.

Baybakov Meets Regan

LD031413 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- Today Nikolay Baybakov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, received Gerald Regan, Canadian Minister of State (International Trade). Questions of the development of trade-and-economic contacts between the USSR and Canada were discussed during the conversation.

Gorbachev Receives Regan

LD031417 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- Today Mikhail Gorbachev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Gerald Regan, Canadian Minister of State (International Trade), who has been in Moscow in connection with the third session of the Soviet-Canadian Mixed Commission for Economic, Industrial, Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

Some matters of Soviet-Canadian relations of mutual interest were touched upon during the conversation.

Geoffrey Pearson, the Ambassador of Canada to the USSR, was present during the conversation.

'ACTIONS NOT WORDS' MEASURE OF U.S. SINCERITY

LD012243 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 1 Jun 83

[Text] President Reagan has given an interview to a group of newsmen who covered the Williamsburg Summit. Dwelling on the prospects of Soviet-American relations, the President said there was a chance they would improve. Commentary is by Viktor Olin:

Hardly anyone doubts now that there is a pressing need for a radical improvement in Soviet-American relations. Leading American observers are unanimous that Soviet-American relations are now at their lowest mark in the past 20 years. Practically everything positive that has been achieved through the tremendous efforts of politicians, diplomats, experts and public figures has been lost.

The blame for this rests squarely with the Reagan administration that not only refused to hold talks or stalled other talks on easing tensions and curbing the arms race, but undertook moves aimed at inciting hostility and building up confrontations.

Among these moves was the launching of a crusade against socialism and the adoption of giant military programs to secure superiority over the Soviet Union. It would be quite unrealistic to expect the huge United States military-political machine, which has gathered considerable momentum as a result of the policies of the Reagan administration, to reverse suddenly. It would be more logical to expect that the President, having wished to ease the improvement of Soviet-American relations, would at least try and slow down the dangerous movement of that machine. This could be achieved by various means. For instance, by declaring that the United States renounces its first use of nuclear arms or accepts a nuclear freeze, upon which, incidentally, millions of American insist.

But Mr Reagan did nothing of the kind. It was implied in his statement at the news conference that an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union is possible only if this country assumes the pose of a penitent sinner and humbly seeks a change of heart on the part of the President of the United States. The President also implied that the Soviet Union should, above all, accept the deployment of upgraded American missiles in Western Europe and meet all American demands at the talks on nuclear arms in Europe. If the Soviet Union fails to agree to this and disarm unilaterally, it, according to Mr Reagan, will bear the responsibility for the further build-up of world tensions.

It is really difficult to say for whom the United States President's propagandistic rhetorics were meant. He must be fully aware of the fact that the Soviet Union judges the sincerity of intentions not by words but by actions. A high and mighty stand and ultimatums are the wrong way to achieve any improvement in Soviet-American relations.

MOSCOW ENGLISH ON PROGRAMMING TO N. AMERICA

LD262142 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 May 83

[From the "Moscow Mailbag" program presented by Boris (Miskyevich) and other unidentified presenter]

[Excerpts] [Unidentified presenter] And our final request today comes from our North American counterpart, Mr (John Petrel). As a radio announcer in America, writes Mr (Petrel), I'd be interested in any information you could supply me in how programming is recorded and transmitted to the United States.

[(Miskyevich)] Well, first of all we will be sending you a booklet to this effect that we hope you will find useful. More specifically, (?I'd) tell you that all of our programming to North America is prerecorded on regular tape shortly before air time, which is 0200, and those tapes are subsequently played back to you throughout the early morning. The radio signal is relayed by several powerful transmitters in the shortwave bands. And I am told that under normal radio conditions, our signal is heard loud and clear in almost any part of the United States and Canada. Our major handicap is that shortwave radios are not that widespread in North America and there is no way of telling how many people listen to us at any particular moment.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS U.S.-PRC TRADE DEVELOPMENTS

PM060927 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 4

[N. Nikitin article: "China-United States: Trade and Economic Ties"]

[Text] Many commentaries were inspired in the foreign press, particularly the U.S. press, by the first session of the Chinese-American Joint Commission on Trade and the third conference of the Chinese-American Commission on Scientific and Technical Cooperation, both held in Beijing in May. Observers noted the high level of the meetings -- the American delegations were headed by G. Keyworth, science adviser to the U.S. President, and M. Baldrige, secretary of commerce. The latter conveyed to the Chinese leaders a personal message from Reagan. On the Chinese side the talks were conducted respectively by Fang Yi, minister in charge of the State Scientific and Technological Commission, and Chen Muhua, minister of foreign economic relations and trade. The commentaries also draw attention to the fact that both sides tried to make the talks as constructive as possible and to do everything possible to alleviate contradictions and unresolved questions.

As a result of the commission's sessions and other contacts between U.S. and Chinese representatives, agreements were reached on a number of questions and projects in bilateral cooperation and organizational and legal measures and conditions favoring the activity of American capital in China. It was decided to hold talks to prepare an agreement on industrial cooperation. According to M. Baldrige's statement the Chinese representatives gave the U.S. delegation a list of "priority projects" whose implementation they are interested in involving the American side in.

The sides reached agreement on the opening of new offices of American banks in China and on further steps to organize the familiarization of American business with the possibilities for capital investments in the PRC. The sides agreed to begin bilateral talks without delay to elaborate guarantees concerning the protection of American investments in the PRC against "noncommercial risk." A group of major U.S. engineering construction and mining corporations is already involved in projects for developing the energy and raw materials base in southern and western regions of China.

As for scientific and technical ties, progress in implementing some 150 bilateral projects was examined and a number of new programs were discussed.

For all this, observers note, behind the publicity for achievements in bilateral U.S.-Chinese ties -- publicity which is perceptibly being forced, particulary by American representatives -- the desire to "smooth over" the persisting problems in trade and economic relations, which also reflect deeper differences and divergent interests, can be clearly perceived.

Despite the agreement reached on the forthcoming resumption of talks on exports of Chinese textile industry products to the United States, on which the American authorities imposed restrictions early this year, this question is not yet resolved, as the U.S. secretary of commerce admits. The Americans want China to curtail its claims for the expansion of textile exports to the United States. The Chinese side, in return, notes the sharp imbalance between the two countries, an imbalance in favor of U.S. trade: in the period 1972 through 1982 the deficit for the PRC totaled more than $11 billion.

But the most pressing issue -- because, as Western journalists note, of the Chinese side's special interest -- is still that of allowing modern technology access to China from the United States. Beijing complains that Washington is unwilling to lift existing restrictions in this sphere.

M. Baldridge stated at a press conference that certain restrictions on the sale and delivery of strategic goods will continue to apply to the PRC, because the White House is concerned, as he put it, for American national security interests. Judging from press reports the question of deliveries of leading technology and sophisticated machinery to China is giving rise to a debate within the present U.S. Administration. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, not only measures to further "liberalize" the procedure for sales of so-called "dual application" technology -- that is, technology which could be used for either civil or military purposes (on which a decision was adopted some years ago) -- but also the expendiency of supplying articles "which could make a direct, perceptible contribution to China's potential in prohibited military spheres" are being examined.

The purpose of this approach is extremely clear: on the one hand, to try to "appease" Beijing to some extent, and on the other, to attempt to continue to exert levers for playing the "China card," the more so in conditions where the U.S. Administration is strengthening military and other ties with Taiwan. In recent months, the Taiwan problem has taken on additional aspects in U.S.-PRC relations, apart from the question of continuing supplies of American weapons and military equipment to the Taiwan regime. In particular, Washington has given the American company Pan-American permission to resume flights in mid-June on the U.S.-Taiwan air route, which was closed in 1979 when U.S.-PRC diplomatic relations were established. At the same time, the United States is hindering the PRC's admission to the Asian Development Bank and the associated expulsion of Taiwan from that organization. All these new and existing issues leave their imprint on the whole spectrum of Chinese-American relations.

At the May talks in Beijing the Chinese side operated under the flag of the consistent implementation of the "open-door" policy in economic relations with the West. The United States continued the line of, so to speak, "balanced rapproachement." On both sides the approach to concrete questions of trade, economic, scientific and technical ties was dictated by wider political interests.

AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS' TAMBO MEETS ZHAO

LD052013 Moscow World Service in English 1730 GMT 5 Jun 83

[Text] There have been talks in Beijing between the president of the African National Congress of South Africa, Oliver Tambo, and the Chinese prime minister, Zhao Ziyang. Oliver Tambo told a news conference in Beijing, the Chinese side will help the African National Congress in its struggle against the apartheid regime of South Africa. At the talks, Zhao Ziyang condemned the United States and Africa for their attempts to link the issue of Namibian independence with the present of Cuban servicemen in Angola. Observers believe the warm reception given Oliver Tambo in Beijing is proof that China would like to improve relations with national liberation movements in the south of Africa. Earlier this year Beijing played host to the leader of the South-West Africa People's Organization, Sam Nujoma.

JAPAN VIEWED AS 'NUCLEAR STAGING AREA'

LD010556 Moscow TASS in English 0548 GMT 1 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS -- "The events now taking place in Japan show that the country is turning step by step into a big military power, the Pentagon's nuclear staging area, into Washington's ally and accomplice in the plans which imperil peace and security in Asia, "the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes in an article headlined "In the Wake of the Pentagon".

"In order to please Washington," the newspaper points out, "Tokyo binds its country closer and closer to the military chariot of the Pentagon. This process has particularly intensified upon the advent to power of the government headed by Yasuhiro Nakasonge".

A number of Tokyo's lates steps convince one that he more and more openly embarks upon the path of dangerous changes in foreign policy. The prime minister, ignoring the opinion of millions of fellow countrymen, has stated an intention to turn Japan into an "unsinkable aircraft carrier". But the authorities seek not only to make their country a strategic staging area of the USA, they are nurturing plans for preparations for combat actions beyond its boundaries.

With Washington's active support, the Japanese Government is speeding up the strengthening of contacts with the North Atlantic bloc in an attempt to place them at an official government level, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA goes on. The Japanese Government has already probed the question of Japan's joining NATO as an "associated member".

The Tokyo leaders have also signed the statement adopted in Williamsburg on May 30 by the seven major capitalist powers. In the statement the peoples' call for the restoration of the process of detente is ignored. The participatnts in the summit declared with one voice an intention to continue to build up nuclear potential and proceed along the lines of armament.

Washington also shows a no lesser interest in the establishment of contacts between Japan and South Korea in the military field, the newspaper goes on. With each of the countries the USA has military and political agreements, and it is a question of closing the "triangle" by drawing the last line: Tokyo-Seoul.

The ruling circles in Tokyo, justifying their contacts with the dictatorial regime, are stating that the militarily strong South Korea ensures Japan's "security" SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes in conclusion. In so doing they naturally avoid giving an answer to the main question: Does anyone threaten Japan? There is no such threat. Neither the Soviet Union, the DPRK, nor other countries of the region ever showed hostility to their Far Eastern neighbour.

NAKASONE SUPPORT FOR U.S. NUCLEAR POLICY HIT

LD012209 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 1 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Boris Chekhonin:

Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, after his scandalous statement in Williamsburg, has turned to his favourite tactics of diplomatic pirouettes. Addressing a press conference in the United States, he tried to play down his claim to be the principal actor in a political show after Ronald Reagan's script. He said he had been misunderstood when he was described as a zealous and unquestioning advocate of the American plans of nuclear rearmament of Western Europe and Natoisation of Japan.

"Misunderstood"? Not in Japan, anyway. For even within his own party, Nakasone is strongly criticized on these days for his extremist views. As to the opposition, it is even more resolute in speaking about his "betrayal of national interests".

The influential newspaper MAINICHI goes even further. Do Nakasone's remarks correspond to his status of Japanese prime minister? it asks. Well, the question is far from being rhetorical. Thinking, mature politicians usually prefer weighing up carefully consequences of their words.

Indeed, how will Japan benefit from unquestioning support for the deployment of new systems of American nuclear weapons in Western Europe and, to be logical, on Japanese territory as well?

First of all, it does not guarantee stronger international security in Asia and the Far East. Prime Minister Nakasone seems to have forgotten that renunciation of nuclear armaments is the most important factor for ensuring Japan's security. It is not for nothing that MAINICHI deemed it necessary to make an appropriate reminder to the head of government. From the historical viewpoint and its territorial peculiarities, Japan does not benefit from the adherence to the American position-of-strength policy and nuclear sabre-rattling, the newspaper writes. The prime minister should not forget that the densely populated country with its concentrated industrial zones is extremely vulnerable even in the conditions of the so-called "limited" nuclear war.

The Japanese press stresses that the premier's part of "zealous advocate of Reagan's political philosophy" does not have only an American basis. Newspapers justly note that Nakasone's personal ambitions also contributed to his becoming a nuclear troubadour in Williamsburg. It is known that he has long dreamt of becoming a "strong individual" in the country's history. These ambitions have been formulated in his controversial book "My Life in Politics", translated into English, by the way, by one of the infamous CIA employees.

Thus, the American pressure in Williamsburg complemented the premier's personal ambitions. But the trouble is that it is the Japanese people who will have to pay for them, and a heavy price at that.

IZVESTIYA ON NAKASONE'S MISSILES STANCE

LD032027 Moscow TASS in English 1812 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- Lately the Reagan administration more and more actively uses the Japanese "factor" in putting through the so-called global approach to the question of medium-range missiles, which virtually pursues the aim of making it more difficult to reach accords in Geneva, writes [the] newspaper IZVESTIYA. The stand of the prime minister of Japan -- the country which experienced the monstrous consequences of the use of atomic weapons by the United States -- actually adds fuel to the fire of the nuclear arms race both on a global and regional scale, the newspaper points out.

A question is asked in the Japanese press whether Nakasone's stand will lead to a growth of tension in the Far East as well. Contrary to the will of the peace-loving public, the Government of Japan is secretly steering a course towards militarizing the country and undermining the peaceful provisions of the Japanese constitution.

Nakasone marked his advent to power by a statement about endeavours to turn Japan into an "unsinkable aircraft carrier", the newspaper recalls.

These words, incidentally, were pronounced during the official visit to the USA. Judging by everything that was not a slip of the tongue or a chance phrase uttered in order to please Washington.

At the summit meeting of the developed capitalist countries in Williamsburg the prime minister of Japan unreservedly supported the U.S. Administration's policy aimed at deploying new U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe. The opinion of the Japanese press is that this means an official expression of Japan's readiness to accede to the NATO decision, IZVESTIYA notes.

Such a stand with regard to the present destructive course of the White House on the cardinal matters of war and peace has put not only the Japanese on their guard, but also the West Europeans who justly point out that the problem of deploying new U.S. missiles in Western Europe is not so "carefree" a matter as it is being presented, the newspaper emphasises.

NAKASONE EFFORT TO JOIN JAPAN WITH NATO RAPPED

OW031503 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 2 Jun 83

[Yuriy Afonin commentary]

[Text] Many observers, both foreign and Japanese, have noticed that Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone has shown a tendency to make bellicose remarks rather freely and thoughtlessly since his arrival in the United States, and that such a tendency certainly had a great deal of hidden meaning. He showed the same tendency and became known for his statements about the "unsinkable aircraft carrier," and about plans to "blockade international straits" during his visit to the United States in January. He also showed the same tendency during his recent visit to the United States. After attending the Williamsburg Summit, Prime Minister Nakasone stated that American medium-range missiles should be deployed in Western Europe and that Japan-NATO relations should be strengthened. Such militaristic statements by the Japanese prime minister during his visit to the United States indicate, more clearly than ever, that Japan has been drawn more deeply into U.S. aggressive strategy.

The Japan of today no longer plays the role of a "younger brother" in the Japan-U.S. security system, but it is no exaggeration to say that the Japanese Government is manipulated by the American Government and the former has come to follow readily the instructions of the latter.

Many papers report that at the Williamsburg Summit the West European leaders were dumbfounded at Prime Minister Nakasone's remarks on the need to deploy American medium-range missiles in Western Europe. Their astonishment was quite natural since no one had expected such blunt interference by Japan into the internal affairs of West European countries where the majority of the people were firmly opposed to turning their countries into nuclear hostages of the United States. MAINICHI SHIMBUN reported that British Prime Minister Thatcher, known for her positive support of the plan to deploy American missiles in Western Europe, asked Prime Minister Nakasone whether the missile deployment issue was really of such great significance to Japan when she heard of her Japanese counterpart's impetuous remarks.

Such a reaction is certainly quite natural. What if some country, let us say a certain West European country, criticized the deployment of American F-16 fighter-bombers at the Misawa Air Base in Japan, or the calls at Japanese ports by American warships carrying nuclear weapons? Such action would naturally cause justifiable protests in Japan. It is no wonder that the Japanese prime minister's militaristic remarks should be condemned by public opinion in Western Europe, particularly by those who have launched a strong anti-war campaign on the European Continent.

Nevertheless, the Japanese prime minister not only attempted to suggest to West European countries what to do and not to do in regard to missile deployments, but boldly attempted to instruct the Soviet Union about what to do and not to do in regard to its own national defense. In other words, Prime Minister Nakasone wants to see American missiles deployed in Western Europe, constituting a menace to the Soviet Union, but does not want to see the Soviet Union take measures to strengthen its own security. He does not want to allow such things to happen. Nevertheless, it is too naive to think that a sovereign state will consent to such unilateral disarmament.

The Williamsburg summit also signifies that Japan has taken another big stride forward in rearranging its relations with NATO countries in both military and political activities. Closer relations have been expeditiously established between Japan and NATO countries since the Nakasone cabinet was formed, as clearly indicated by Foreign Minister Abe's trip in Western Europe last January. Since the Japanese prime minister has affixed his signature to the Williamsburg joint statement on the military issue, the document which embodies the complete strategic concept of the NATO countries, there is no room for doubt about Japan's actual integration with the NATO bloc, no matter how much Japanese official circles may attempt to refute it.

Furthermore, TOKYO SHIMBUN reported that the expansion of cooperation between Japan and the NATO stages was one issue carefully discussed at the talks between Foreign Minister Abe and U.S. Secretary of State Shultz right before the Williamsburg Summit. When this report is taken into consideration it is quite obvious how deeply Japan is involved in the aggressive strategy of the United States.

The Japanese prime minister's remarks that if international tension should be whipped up as a result of an attempt to fulfill the aim of the U.S. policy -- or, to be more precise, the deployment of nuclear missiles in western Europe -- should be taken with caution. This cannot be helped. This was the first time that Japanese Government leaders have ever made such an open appeal for intensifying international tension. However, the very policy that the Japanese Government has long pursued will certainly lead to such intensified tension.

The expansion of U.S. military presence in the Far East, a stimulus to Japan, and Japan's own increased military capabilities, have naturally increased acute tension in the Far East.

The recent visit of the Japanese prime minister to the United States is a clear-cut indication that Japanese official circles have become an increasingly ardent conspirator of the Reagan administration in schemes to stir up international tension and to continue the reckless arms race. Such a policy endangers the peace of the whole world and certainly conforms neither to the interests of the Japanese people nor of any country.

AUSTRALIAN-USSR RELATIONS 'MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL'

LD012332 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 1 Jun 83

[Excerpt] Australia's Foreign Minister Bill Hayden has announced full normalization of relations with the Soviet Union. This means a lifting of all restrictions on cultural, sporting and scientific contacts. Igor Bestuzhev elaborates:

As Bill Hayden said, sanctions against the Soviet Union have proved to be counterproductive. Whem imposing them in January of 1980 under Washington's pressure, Australia's Conservative government, which was defeated at the recent elections, claimed that they would cause damage to the Soviet Union. It has transpired however that the sanctions have failed to harm this country. They only affected Australia's interests because the Soviet Union depends on foreign trade much less than Australia does. By imposing sanctions, Canberra restricted its own opportunities for expanding its exports to one of the world's biggest buyers and (?took) this step at a time when because of an economic recession in the capitalist world, its exports were going through great difficulty.

The Soviet Union is a country of powerful scientific potential. Many scientists in Australia have said that cooperation with the USSR in oceanology, in astronomy, and in other fields has stimulated the development of sciences in their country. By following the policy of sanctions the Conservatives deprived them of this stimulant. Now there are reasons to believe that the situation in this sphere will improve and that this will be mutally beneficial to both peoples, as a spokesman for the Soviet Embassy said in Canberra.

In the past, particularly when the Labour Party was in power, the Soviet Union and Australia had substantial experience of developing mutually beneficial economic, cultural, and scientific ties. Their cooperation yielded good results, not only in these spheres. It promoted understanding and trust between the two nations and strengthened world peace in the long run. Soviet-Australian cooperation could exert beneficial influence on the political climate of the entire world and this is particularly important now when this climate has deteriorated.

POL POT GANGS MAKE ARMS PLENTIFUL IN THAILAND

PM011528 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 83 First Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Kalinin dispatch: "Boomerang"]

[Text] Bangkok, 30 May -- General Narong Mahanon, general director of the Thai police, has issued an order for centers for the confiscation of firearms from the population to be opened in the capital and a number of other cities. This measure, according to the general, is needed to make the struggle against the rapidly rising crime rate more effective. Detachments of armed mercenaries ready at any moment to commit violence or simply to kill anyone are in the service of "influential people."

One of the chief tasks of this measure is to close the channels of arms deliveries to the gangsters. Difficulties of not only an organizational but also a political nature will have to be encountered in the course of implementing the measure, police officials believe. The point is that weapons, particularly in recent years, have become available to anyone who wishes to acquire them. Pol Pot's bandits entrenched in the zone of the Thai-Kampuchean border sell entire consignments of arms: M-16 rifles, M-79 mortars, handgrenades, pistols, and explosives. And Khmer reactionary groupings obtain weapons from abroad without any hindrance, for they enjoy the support of the Thai authorities. According to Washington's designs, the weapons are to be aimed at the neighboring countries of Indochina. However, they also boomerang against Thailand's interests....

PRAVDA CITES DENIAL OF KAMPUCHEA REINFORCEMENT

PM010921 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "SPK Denial"]

[Text] Phnom Penh, 30 May -- Kampuchea's SPK News Agency has resolutely denied allegations by Thai propaganda and the mass media of a number of other countries that Vietnam has introduced new military subunits into Kampuchea. These groundless allegations, the agency points out, are aimed at arousing mistrust of the goodwill action undertaken by Vietnam and Kampuchea, hindering the incipient dialogue between the countries of ASEAN and Indochina, and intensifying tension in Southeast Asia.

It is an open secret, SPK points out, that Thailand is pursuing a policy hostile to the PRK and trying its best to prevent the revival of the Kampuchean people and to undermine their peaceful, creative life. That country's authorities are continuing to fuel tension on the border with the PRK. During May, Thai artillery has repeatedly shelled PRK border regions, aircraft of the Thai Air Force have encroached on the republic's airspace, and ships have violated its territorial waters.

By their totally groundless statements the Thai ruling circles are trying to find a pretext to justify the support they are giving to the remnants of Pol Pot's gangs and to groupings of other Khmer reactionaries. By refusing to give a positive reply to the proposals of the PRK, which wishes to live in peace with its neighbors, Thailand is ignoring the Indochina countries' constructive initiatives aimed at resolving the problems of Southeast Asia by peaceful means.

The Kampuchean people, SPK emphasizes, are confidently traveling the path of building a new life and are tirelessly strengthening unity and cohesion with the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries. Kampuchea, together with Vietnam and Laos, will continue striving actively to make Southeast Asia a region of peace, stability, and cooperation.

VIETNAMESE ARMY CORPS WITHDRAWS FROM KAMPUCHEA

LD011242 Moscow TASS in English 1131 GMT 1 Jun 83

[Text] Hanoi June 1 TASS -- The withdrawal from Kampuchea of the Kyulong Corps of the Vietnamese People's Army, which includes an infantry division and six brigades and regiments of direct subordination, has been completed.

The withdrawal of another contingent of Vietnamese volunteer troops from Kampuchea was carried out in accordance with the statement made by the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam at the meeting of the leaders of the Indochinese countries in Vientiane last February and the decision of the conference of the foreign ministers of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic in Phnom Penh last April.

The VIETNAM NEWS AGENCY, VNA, reported that the Kyulong Corps discharged its internationalist duty in Kampuchea with honour. The services of the Vietnamese troops were highly appreciated by the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, the government and the people of the PRK.

WEINBERGER'S WEST EUROPE TOUR DRAWS CRITICISM

LD032144 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 3 Jun 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] The propaganda dust from the Williamsburg meeting has not yet settled, the main dramatis personae have not yet managed to cross the ocean on their way home and already Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defense, has left them all behind.

The main aims of his latest trip to Western Europe were: a) to confirm once and for all the schedule of the planned and timely -- these are Weinberger's words -- deployment of Pershing II and Cruise missiles on the territory of the FRG and certain other countries; b) to force NATO states to increase once again their spending on military requirements; c) to remind once again about the provocative plan to redeploy U.S. forces stationed in the FRG further to the East, to the border of the GDR. This is the range of questions discussed by the Pentagon chief first in Bonn with Woerner, the FRG minister of defense, and then in Brussels, in the wider circle of the far-from-sacred Atlantic family. It is true that both Woerner and Weinberger and others have never yet missed a chance, even in discussing the schedule and purely technical details of transforming the western part of the European Continent into a U.S. nuclear missile storehouse, to come out with the standard phrase: if the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva should end without result... It is true, however, that this is wholly for naive people, for Washington's entire efforts are indeed directed at a breakdown of the Geneva talks. Now no one doubts this.

The deployment of missiles is a matter which has been decided and which is obligatory, NATO generals affirm. Why then is it so obligatory? In view of the real Soviet military threat, the so standard response still goes. All the same, comrades, let's analyze this.

The overwhelming majority of the population in Western Europe, apart from those completely fooled and deceived by anti-Soviet propaganda, does not believe in such a threat. I have not yet mentioned scientists, researchers, cultural figures, doctors, clergymen, who are just as tired of the cock-and-bull story of the Soviet threat as we are. So who is still trumpeting about the Soviet military threat? Only those who themselves are frenziedly whipping up the arms race; the Pentagon, the NATO military top brass, and the military-industrial complex which reaps gigantic profits from dealing in death. But perhaps they themselves sincerely believe the notorious threat from the East, and really fear a sudden Soviet attack. During my trips to the FRG and some other Soviet attack. During my trips to the FRG and some other Western countries, I posed this question to Bundeswehr generals, quite highly-placed officials of the foreign policy departments of these countries, and even the editors of such an anti-Soviet publication as DIE WELT, which makes more noise than all the rest about the Soviet threat. And, believe me, not one of the people I talked to, in private conversations, confirmed his official fears. Many of them, however, talked of the Soviet Union as a great peace-loving power.

So, what's it all about? Why are they so dramatically nervous of a threat which they themselves don't believe in? The reason, they told me, is that the Soviet Union possesses a powerful military potential, which, you see, might give it the opportunity to unleash a war. That's what sort of people they are -- simpletons. They don't appear to know that the Soviet Union is the first, and so far the only, nuclear power which has undertaken a commitment never to be first to use nuclear weapons. They don't appear to have heard of the historic proposal by the Warsaw Pact countries to conclude an agreement with NATO countries on the non-use of force.

They do not appear to know about the numerous, constructive peace proposals of the Soviet Union, which have also remained and still remain to this time unanswered. These people want only one thing, for the Soviet Union to disarm. They want our country to disarm unilaterally, they want to achieve military superiority over us; that's where all the difficulty lies. But such illusions will never come true.

The Soviet Union will never allow anyone to destroy the approximate balance of forces, it cannot and never will allow the fundamental principle of balance and equal security to be destroyed. The Soviet Union and its allies will not fail to respond to Pentagon and NATO actions with appropriate counteraction. This is stated quite clearly and definitely in the statement by the Soviet Government.

WEINBERGER IN NORWAY FOR TALKS, FOUR-DAY TOUR

Arrival Noted

LD032154 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 3 Jun 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Edward Matjakanov]

[Text] Weinberger has now arrived in Oslo on a 4-day visit. Immediately after his arrival in the Norwegian capital, the Pentagon chief announced that he was to visit important installations, military installations, in the Troms area, and in other northern areas of the country. He gave to understand that the United States views Norway as the major NATO strategic outpost in northern Europe. The Swedish Government's proposal of creating in Europe a zone free of battle nuclear weapons is, of course, unacceptable to the United States secretary.

Visit 'Patently Militaristic'

LD031223 Moscow TASS in English 1135 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The U.S. defense secretary is reported to have arrived on a four-day visit in Oslo to hold talks with Norwegian Prime Minister Kaare Willoch, to meet Defence Minister Anders Sjaastad, who currently is chairman of the NATO Eurogroup, and to pay a visit to Norway's main naval base, Olavsvern. What is the purpose of this voyage of the Pentagon chief to a country situated in close proximity of the Soviet border?

This question is all the more natural since Norway has long been viewed by Washington, who is trying to drag Western Europe even deeper into its aggressive policy and to turn it into the Pengagon's hostage, as one of NATO's main staging areas in the north of the continent.

Last February ways to increase Norway's role in NATO were discussed in detail during the talks between the Norwegian premier and U.S. President Reagan and the self-same Weinberger. NATO holds exercises and manoeuvres in Norwegian territory, and Norwegian naval bases are used by American and British missile ships. In 1981 the USA and Norway signed an agreement on stationing heavy American military hardware and combat technology in Norway and recently Oslo officially announced its decision to build in the country 9 new stations of the radio navigational system "Loran-5", which, according to the newspaper DAGBLADET, will be intended first and foremost for American submarines. Certain forces in the country, doing Washington's bidding, are making incessant attempts to whip up anti-Sovietism in Norway and to exploit all sorts of anti-Soviet myths.

The United States is insistently trying to subvert the principles of Norwegian military policy, under which Norway has renounced the deployment of foreign troops and atomic weapons in its territory in peace time.

Against this background Weinberger's Norwegian voyage is acquiring a very definite coloration. Anyway, the Pentagon chief himself does not conceal the objectives of his visits it follows from reports coming in that, hardly having arrived in Oslo, he immediately made flagrantly militarist statements trying to distort and smear Soviet peace policy and to scare the Norwegians with the non-existent "Soviet threat," and rejected out of hand Sweden's proposal on establishing in Europe a zone without battlefield nuclear weapons. Furthermore, he claimed that the strategic importance of Norway had lately grown. How should this statement be taken?

It is an open secret that when the Pentagon begins to stress the "strategic importance" of one NATO country or another, it usually means that American strategists intend to use the country in question even more intensively for all sorts of military actions primarily against the USSR.

In short, however you look at the voyage of the Pentagon chief to Norway, it is obvious that this voyage is patently militarist and, moreover, provocative. But both Mr. Weinberger and those who are fussing over him in Oslo should remember that such provocative actions often boomerang.

Press Conference Remarks Attacked

LD041653 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 4 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS -- TASS news analyst Anatoliy Magari writes:

U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger tells a new lie, one more atrocious than another, virtually every day. He said at a press conference in Oslo on Saturday, for instance, that the submarines presumably spotted off the Swedish and Norwegian coasts recently belonged to the Soviet Navy.

The Pentagon chief could not cite any proof to back his allegations. He did not need any, one way or the other: Why trouble oneself with such "trifles" when the ground had already been prepared? Certain Scandinavian newspapers, obviously taking their cue from Washington, have published dozens of articles during the past few months, claiming that "soviet submarines" were most certainly intruders in the territorial waters of Sweden and Norway.

Because of all this, without wasting time to back his allegations with at least some facts, Mr Weinberger concentrated on exposing the sinister "motives" of the Soviet command in sending ships to the shores of neighbouring countries.

The chief of the U.S. military establishment displayed as much imagination in discoursing on nuclear warheads and missiles which the Soviet Union has presumably been maintaining for a long time in the territory of its East European allies. The newspaper WASHINGTON POST amazed the world by an account of a meeting between its correspondent and a certain top official and asked for explanations [from] Weinberger himself as the creator of the new myth.

The official in question, according to the newspaper, clarified the matter with Weinberger in an attempt to clear the confusion over the remarks made by him in Brussels and Bonn last week. However, the defence secretary confirmed that he had indeed had in mind the deployment of Soviet nuclear warheads and also launchers for missiles capable of carrying nuclear weapons in Eastern Europe.

One can hardly believe that the U.S. defence secretary can be informed as poorly as those American leaders who, according to DER SPIEGEL of West Germany, draw on the READER'S DIGEST for information about the surrounding world. Rather, he engages in deliberate misinformation.

At the same time Mr Weinberger as well as other NATO leaders should heed the warning of the Soviet Government: The decision of the USA and NATO to begin the deployment of new American missiles in Europe, if it is put into effect, will force the USSR to revise its last year's decision on unilateral moratorium on the future deployment of medium-range systems in Europe. The need would also arise to take, by agreement with the other Warsaw Treaty countries, other measures to field additional systems with the objective of creating the necessary counterbalance to the growing grouping of U.S. forward-based nuclear systems in Europe and the nuclear weapons of other NATO countries. Lastly, proper measures will have to be taken in response with regard to the territory of the United States itself.

Norway 'Under Pressure'

LD041305 Moscow TASS in English 1241 GMT 4 Jun 83

[Text] Oslo June 4 TASS -- The U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who came here for an official visit, started a series of inspection trips. First he went to the northern regions where NATO's military facilities are concentrated. The purpose of his visit is to further draw Norway into Washington's militaristic policy. The U.S. strives to impose upon that country new types of armaments. The Norwegian Government has already brought the modernized U.S. "Hawk" anti-aircraft missiles. Negotiations are under way on the purchase of "F-16 fighter-bombers, besides, under an agreement concluded by Norway and the U.S., depots of U.S. heavy military equipment will be situated in this Scandinavian country.

Local observers point out that the voyage of the head of the U.S. military department is of obviously provocative character. This also follows from statements of Weinberger himself, who advocated a further militarisation of NATO's "northern flank" in a talk with journalists. He said that he regarded Norway as an important strategic outpost in the north of Europe and resorted to allegations that the Soviet Union was "threatening" Norway.

The local press points that Washington is bringing pressure to bear on the Norwegian Government, seeking to get its consent to move to Norway, "in case of need", major contingents of U.S. troops. These actions of the U.S. Administration arouse protests of the Norwegian people who do not want to be hostages of Washington's aggressive policy. On the day of Weinberger's arrival in the city of Harstad, a demonstration was held at the airport there, whose participants protested the arms race unleashed by the Reagan administration and demanded the cancellation of the NATO decision on the deployment of new American nuclear missile first-strike weapons on the territory of a number of West European countries.

FINLAND'S KOIVISTO TO VISIT SOVIET UNION 6 JUNE

Finnish Leaders Interviewed

LD021956 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 2 Jun 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpts] In 3 days President Mauno Koivisto of Finland arrives in the Soviet Union.

It will be his first official visit to our country. Both in the USSR and in Finland very great significance is attached to it; widescale preparations are being made for it, and I was convinced of this, having just been in Finland as member of a group of Soviet journalists. We talked to President Mauno Koivisto himself, with the Finnish Premier Kalevi Sorsa, the foreign minister Paave Vayrynen, met distinguished figures of the main political parties, mayors and representatives of Finnish business circles. Perhaps the main impression which was left from these meetings was the striving of the Finns to preserve and strengthen relations of friendship and goodneighborliness between our countries. Today they have become natural and usual; they embrace the most varied fields: politics, trade, science, cultural life. We now speak not just of the quantitative increase in our trade -- although we should note that the Soviet Union has a quarter share of Finland's foreign trade -- we speak of coproduction.

In our trade relations there are currently certain problems, also connected with the fluctuating prices on the world market which upset the existing balance, but it is characteristic that both Finnish businessmen and politicians have voiced the conviction that these problems will be successfully resolved while maintaining the overall balance of trade at a high level. They stressed that commercial and economic relations with our country are extremely favorable for Finland. The characteristics of these relations are continuity, planning, long-term nature, and they have permitted Finland to bear more lightly the consequences of the crisis gripping the whole Western world.

"Trade with the USSR," Finnish Premier Sorsa said in a talk with us, "is a powerful stabilizing facet for the Finnish economy."

During the coming visit of Mauno Koivisto to the Soviet Union a protocol will be signed on an early extension of the Soviet Finnish treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. That treaty, signed in 1948, laid a firm foundation for development of Finland's peace-loving foreign policy, its friendly cooperation with the Soviet Union. Some disliked the treaty, now all Finns favor extending it.

Of course, friendship between our countries is not to certain people's liking. Certain official figures and propaganda services in the West claim that by developing relations with the Soviet Union, Finland loses her autonomy. We talked about this in Finland's parliament, where we met several distinguished MP's. One of them, honorary chaiman of the Finnish Rural Party, Veikko Vennamo, pointed out that accusations were made against Finland whenever it did something out of step with the wishes of the West. "But we don't want to be an outpost of the West," Vennamo stressed. "We want to serve the interests of Finland, and for our country relations with the Soviet Union are of prime importance. Note, at the same time, that I represent a bourgeois party," he emphasized.

Visit Previewed

LD051452 Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 5 Jun 83

[Text] Mauno Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic, arrives on an official visit to our country on 6 June at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and of the Soviet Government. He was chosen as President of Finland on 26 January 1982.

Mauno Koivisto stresses his determination to steadfastly continue the peaceful foreign policy of Finland, worked out by his predecessors. Presidents Paasikivi and Kekkonen, and the course for the development of relations of friendship and good-neighborliness with the Soviet Union on the basis of the 1982 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance.

Mauno Koivisto has more than once visited the Soviet Union. In March 1982 he was in the Soviet Union on a business trip. In December of that year he took part in the festivities in Moscow on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR. The TASS reports about the arrival of Mauno Koivisto say that the Soviet people cordially welcome the president of the Finnish Republic and, in his person, the friendly people of Finland. They express the confidence that the official visit by Mauno Koivisto to our country will be a new important contribution to the development of relations of friendship and fruitful cooperation between the USSR and Finland in the interests of the peoples of both countries, the consolidation of peace, and international security.

Relation's History Recapped

LD051931 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jun 83

[From the Vremya newscast; talk by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] The coming arrival of the Finnish leader in our country has special significance. This is Mauno Koivisto's first visit to the USSR in his capacity as head of the Finnish state. During the visit a protocol will be signed on the extension, ahead of schedule, of the term of duration of the Soviet-Finnish treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. This treaty, concluded in 1948, laid a firm foundation for the development of Soviet-Finnish relations. It is typical that when it was signed not everybody in Finland by any means approved of this step; a measure of distrust existed. But time is the best judge; the results achieved in the 35 years of the treaty's duration have underlined the correctness and the farsightedness of the decision adopted. Relations of goodneighborliness between our countries have become natural and normal. Cooperation now embraces the most varied of spheres, from regular political contacts to a cultural exchange and tourism. The USSR has become one of Finland's biggest trading partners. A quarter of Finland's trade is with us, and we are talking not only about the growing scale of cooperation but also about its deepening.

Finland is the first capitalist country with which the USSR is conducting the joint construction of industrial projects. Our states are also drawn together by their common efforts to guarantee peace in the international arena. Finland's peace-loving foreign policy, which achieved wide renown as the Kaleva Kekkonen Line, has won respect throughout the world. It is no accident that the first general European conference on peace and security is linked with the name of the Finnish capital, Helsinki.

Various strata of Finnish society are calling for the further consolidation of goodneighborly relations with the USSR today. I have been able to see this for myself, having just been to Finland with a group of Soviet journalists. In a conversation with us, President Mauno Koivisto stressed that the extension of the duration of the treaty with the USSR in unchanged form is convincing proof, in current international conditions, of the fact that no ad hoc fluctuations in international politics can shake Soviet-Finnish cooperation.

Representatives of all Finland's main parties, including the opposition parties, are included in the delegation that will accompany the president during his visit to our country. This is not simply an item for the sake of protocol. It is a political gesture filled with special meaning. As Finnish officials have pointed out, it is designed to show that the president's course toward extending links with the Soviet Union is supported by the whole Finnish people.

BADEN-WURTTEMBERG PREMIER'S USSR VISIT CONTINUES

FRG Embassy Hosts Luncheon

PM031141 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 May 83 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Visit Continues"]

[Excerpts] A discussion took place on 30 May between V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, and L. Spaeth, prime minister of Baden-Wurttemberg (FRG), in which questions relating to USSR-FRG relations and a number of current international problems of mutual interest were touched on.

A. Meyer-Landrut, FRG ambassador to the USSR, gave a luncheon to mark the arrival of L. Spaeth and the representatives of the FRG business community accompanying him. M.S. Solomentsev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; L.A. Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and other officials were present at the luncheon.

Holds Press Conference

PM031058 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Guests From the FRG"]

[Text] At a 31 May press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists L. Spaeth, prime minister of Baden-Wurttemberg Land, expressed satisfaction with the talks held in Moscow. The Soviet Union's positions on all urgent problems of the present time, the guest said, have become clearer to us.

We came to the USSR so as to confirm the FRG's desire to cooperate with the Soviet Union. The meetings on Soviet soil have convincingly shown the USSR's readiness to deepen and develop a constructive partnership. I am convinced that there are good opportunities for the further strengthening of economic cooperation between the two countries.

Touching on his impressions from the tour of the country, the guest said that very much has altered here in the 16 years since his previous visit to the Soviet Union. Moscow has become more beautiful. The scope of housing construction is striking. The people's living standards have increased noticeably.

In the evening L. Spaeth, who visited our country at the invitation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and the representatives of FRG business circles accompanying him, departed from the USSR.

At the airport the guests were seen off by M.S. Solomentsev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

FRG'S SPD PRESS CONFERENCE ON MISSILES VIEWED

LD032226 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Bonn June 3 TASS --TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy reports: Hans-Jochen Vogel and Horst Ehmke, respectively chairman and deputy chairman of the SPD, [Social Democratic Party] faction in the Bundestag, held a press conference here today.

They presented a document, adopted by the leadership of the SPD parliamentary faction, on the Social-Democrats' position in the field of the policy of security, disarmament, and Geneva talks on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe.

The lengthy document, in Vogel's words, "reflects the Social-Democrats' substantiated line" with regard to the above problems.

It notes the wholesome nature of the policy of detente, which characterised the 1970's, and stresses the need to continue to develop constructive relations and cooperation between East and West and facilitate disarmament in every way. This policy positively influenced the development of the situation in Europe as a whole. But the current policy of the U.S. Administration, which is directed at confrontation, is threatening to eliminate the gains of detente. "We reject the course of confrontation with the East both in trade and in military and political fields," the document emphasises. It also admits that the Soviet Union has no global military superiority over NATO whatsoever.

The Social-Democrats urged an end to the nuclear missile race, which is threatening world peace, and an "East-West partnership in the field of security". They welcomed the proposal to set up a zone free of nuclear weapons in the north of Europe as "an important step towards a non-nuclear Europe."

The document pays much attention to Geneva talks.

Favouring "a compromise acceptable to both sides as a result of negotiations", the SPD faction at the same time remained at its known positions, characterized by insufficient clarity and consistency, which find expression, among other things, in the fact that the document does not contain a sufficiently explicit statement on whether the leadership of Social-Democrats in the FRG is opposed to the deployment of the U.S. missiles in Western Europe or not. It is going to give an answer to this principled question only as late as this autumn.

FRENCH DEBATE ON WILLIAMSBURG MISSILES CITED

LD031916 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- TASS news analyst Anatoliy Magari [spelling as received] writes: Speaking in the course of a debate on issues of foreign policy in the senate, French External Relations Minister Claude Cheysson once again reiterated readiness to abide by Reagan's position, which has been officially adopted by the military bloc NATO. He expressed himself in favor of the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament, claiming that Soviet missiles in Europe upset the balance of forces in that continent and even "create a problem to the entire world", while the forward-based systems of the United States and the nuclear armaments of Britain and France itself, in his logic, upset nothing and create no problems.

Cheysson tried to exonerate France's refusal for its nuclear forces to be taken into account in analysing the alignment of forces by claiming "allegiance to the position of General de Gaulle". But he failed to explain why his country, which is "independent" and "not part of the NATO military wing", signed in Williamsburg the document on military matters, which had been drawn up by strategy-makers from the White House for those who are ready to sail in the wake of their policy. The references to De Gaulle in the French minister's speech sounded all the more irrelevent as the founder of the Fifth Republic steered France away from its position of a satellite of the overseas power and proclaimed the strategy of "defence on all azimuths," a strategywhich they in Paris have since some time preferred not to remember.

Centrist Jean Lecanuet, who took the floor in the discussion, said that the statement on military matters adopted in Williamsburg was factual confirmation of "consent to the deployment of Pershings and cruise missiles" of the United States in Europe.

Communist Serge Boucheny, on his part, emphasised that the Williamsburg statement "expands the North Atlantic Alliance in such a way that this may damage France's independence."

In response to the Communists' proposal that all European governments be drawn into the talks in Geneva, devoted to disarmament in Europe, the official government spokesman said: "There may be no question of France taking part in the Geneva talks."

CPSU DELEGATION RETURNS HOME FROM SWEDEN

PM031059 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 83 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Delegation's Return"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by V.N. Ptitsyn, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Murmansk CPSU Obkom, which participated in the work of the 27th Congress of the Swedish Workers Party-Communists, has returned to Moscow.

FATAH DELEGATION MEETS SOVIET OFFICIALS

LD031213 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- A meeting was held today between Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Vitaliy Ruben and a delegation of the Movement for National Liberation of Palestine (Fatah), led by member of the Fatah Central Committee Salah Halaf. The delegation is in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

There were also meetings and conversations with leaders of the committee at the Soviet coordination committee for preparations for the international conference on the question of Palestine. Problems linked with the Middle East situation, topical issues of Soviet-Palestinian cooperation, and the broadening of the campaign of international solidarity with the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their inalienable rights, for peace and justice in the Middle East, were considered.

The Fatah delegation laid a wreath at the Lenin Mausoleum. A wreath was also laid at the Unknown Soldier's Tomb at the Kremlin Wall.

USSR, ALGERIA HOLD POLITICAL CONSULTATIONS

LD060920 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0650 GMT 6 Jun 83

[Text] Algeria, 6 Jun (TASS) -- Political consultations have taken place here between a delegation from the USSR Foreign Ministry headed by Nikita Ryzhov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and representatives of the Foreign Ministry of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria [DPRA]. During the consultations, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, there was an exchange of opinions on a broad circle of topical international problems. In doing this special attention was paid to the situation in the Near East and in Africa.

The Soviet delegation was received by Mohamed Ben Ahmed Abdelghani, the prime minister of the DPRA, and by Ahmed Taleb Ibrahimi, the foreign minister.

ANALYST NOTES U.S. MILITARY PLANS IN LEBANON

LD031827 Moscow TASS in English 1812 GMT 3 Jun 83

["Washington's Cynicism" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- News analyst Boris Shabayev writes: Having pressed Lebanon into signing a settlement "agreement" with Israel, Washington was quick in discarding the guise of a "peacemaker" and in displaying its true aims for the whole world to see. Speaking at the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Nicholas Veliotes admitted that the Reagan administration was not even contemplating the idea of pulling out or reducing the number of U.S. troops in Lebanon. He said it was impossible to predict at the time for how long U.S. Marines, who make the backbone of the so-called multinational force, were going to stay in Lebanon. This is confirmed by the fact that the turning of Lebanon into a site of U.S. military presence in the Middle East was and remains one of the top-priority goals of Washington's Middle East policy.

The statement made by Nicholas Veliotes reveals both the real objectives of such a policy and the ungainly means Washington is using to attain them. Consider this: dispatching U.S. troops to Beirut, no other than President Reagan himself made assurances that their number would be strictly limited and that they would remain in Lebanon for not more than 30 days.

Afterwards the White House made a series of amendments in that schedule, saying that the U.S. Marine contingent would be nonetheless pulled out from Lebanon before the end of 1982. While vague and ill-defined statements were being made one after another, the Pentagon was steadily building up the strength of its contingent and expanded the area of its deployment in Lebanon.

Washington spared no words to justify the presence of U.S. troops on the long-suffering soil of Lebanon. Washington spoke of ensuring security -- and lied, when it went back on its guarantees and let into the Sabra and Shatila Palestinian refugee camps cutthroats who staged a veritable massacre there. Washington talked of its allegiance to sovereignty and unity of Lebanon -- and again it lied, for the agreement imposed on Lebanon as a result of unprecedented pressure cannot be described in any other way than a gross encroachment on independence and legitimate rights of Lebanon. It should be said that U.S. Marines stationed in Lebanon played a prominent role in that dirty game, as did the guns of the U.S. 6th Fleet aimed at Beirut.

Pronouncements by Nicholas Veliotes contrasted with the vows of [the] U.S. President, and Washington's practical actions show that in pursuing its chimerical hegemonistic plans the present U.S. Administration scruples no lie, [as received] cynically violating universal norms of morality and law.

U.S., ISRAELI ANTI-SYRIAN STANCE CRITICIZED

PM060958 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Jun 83 First Edition p 5

[Gennadiy Musayelyan article: "Creeping Aggression: The United States and Israel Prepare a War Against Syria Under the Cover of a 'Peace Agreement' With Lebanon"]

[Excerpt] The United States and Israel are planning aggression against Syria and are seeking to implement the tasks which they did not resolve by the invasion of Beirut: to force the Arab states to take the Camp David path, to make them conclude a separate agreement with Tel Aviv, and thus to isolate the PLO and undermine its authority. As for the American-Zionist plans for so-called "self-determination" on the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip, they are ultimately directed at establishing complete Israeli domination of these territories.

There is a deep-seated pattern to be observed in these criminal acts and schemes. The results of the Camp David deal are well known. It led to the fifth and most bloody Arab-Israeli war in Lebanon. And now, while talking constantly about "peace" with Lebanon, the United States and Israel are again trying to direct the course of events into a separate channel. The Lebanese-Israeli agreement, which imposes a military protectorate system on Beirut and which is leading to worsening relations between Lebanon's various political forces and religious communities, is also the fruit of U.S. mediatory efforts. In so doing it is also turning out to be against all the Arabs as a whole, since it flagrantly flouts the well-known decisions taken in Fes and ignores the fundamental means for a Near East settlement approved at the summit forum held there. Lebanon's national-patriotic forces, which are supported by the majority of the country's population, the PLO, Arab countries with progressive regimes, and all true patriots, condemn this agreement which is bringing new disasters not only to Lebanon but to the whole region.

The United States has not confined itself to imposing discriminatory conditions on Beirut but has signed a secret agreement with Israel whereby Tel Aviv has received an assurance that measures taken with the aim of "ensuring security beyond its frontiers will not cause dissatisfaction on the part of the United States."

Thus, sanction has been given to the continuance of creeping aggression. Moreover, as has almost always been the case, this sanction is accompanied by new military supplies. President Reagan has permitted the shipment of 75 F-16 aircraft to Tel Aviv. American technology for the production of the Lavi fighter is also being passed to it. "We have enormous strategic interests in the Near East," U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has stated.

The fact that highly placed U.S. emissaries have taken to visiting Lebanon recently is also worthy of attention. General Barrow, commander of the American Marine Corps, recently made an "inspection visit" here. Prior to his visit Admiral Rowden, commander of the U.S. 6th Fleet, and John Vessey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were here. One should add that there is yet another group of U.S. naval ships making its way toward the shores of Lebanon.

All of this, as the Arab press emphasizes, indicates one thing: large-scale aggression against Syria is being prepared. The influential Kuwaiti newspaper AL-ANBA' has reported that the Israeli general staff has already worked out an appropriate plan in this regard, which was discussed during U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz' recent visit. The plan envisages the aggressor's troops advancing in two directions: toward Damascus and the city of Homs. It is also planned to strike yet another blow across the Jordanian territory against the Syrian troops in the Golan Heights. The newspaper reports: the Israeli command has already concentrated 2 tank divisions and 2 separate mechanized brigades in the first echelon of its troops on Lebanese territory, and 2 tank divisions and 1 brigade in the second. These were the figures as of 15 May. The interventionists have also thrown new military contingents into the Al-Biqa' Valley.

The ceaseless creeping aggression by the United States and Israel in the Near East makes the achievement of unity the chief task confronting the Arab countries today. It is vitally necessary for their concerted actions against American imperialism and Israeli expansionism and their hegemonist plans in the region.

The Soviet Union has consistently advocated the earliest just settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Our position -- the calling of a special international conference on the Near East with the participation of all the interested parties, including the PLO -- is well known. This approach to a Near East settlement is fully in accord with the principles approved by the Pan-Arab conference in Fes. It opens up additional possibilities for concerted constructive actions by the Arabs and their friends. Advocating a political settlement of the conflict and firmly rejecting all claims by the United States to dictate its own procedures and laws to other countries and peoples, the USSR reemphasizes that the legitimate rights and interests of all the peoples of the Near East can be secured only with the assistance of the political efforts of each of the interested parties and by means of a just and comprehensive agreement, not by force of arms or by war. Those who think in imperial terms are pursuing a shortsighted and dangerous course. It is fraught with the most serious complications.

IZVESTIYA'S GEYVANDOV HITS U.S. MIDEAST POLICY

PM060837 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by Konstantin Geyvandov under the rubric "Political Observers's Opinion": "Deadlock Policy"]

[Text] The leaders of some Arab countries, particularly those which the Western press usually calls those with "moderate" or "conservative" regimes, sincerely believe, or feign to believe, that the words uttered by U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger when he is speaking of the U.S. Administration's desire to have "other friends as well as

Israel" in the Near East, can be taken at face value. I must note at once that leaders of this kind are decreasing in number with every aggressive turn of the U.S.-Israeli tandem. Nonetheless, from time to time they ask or demand (depending on circumstances) that the U.S. Administration bring pressure to bear on its ally to achieve a just Near East settlement.

However, on each occasion Washington replies with a categorical refusal to take this step. Aware of the weakness of its position, the United States tries somehow to diversify the motives it gives. But an unfailing element of any variation is a hypocritical claim that Israel is a sovereign state and therefore no lateral pressure [so storony] can be brought to bear on it. As a result, this "sovereign state" annexes East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, which belong to the Arabs, is gradually laying hands on the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza strip, is perpetrating aggression against Lebanon, and then, with the aid of its U.S. patron, is foisting on that country a "peace agreement" under which it pledges... not to withdraw its occupying troops from Lebanese territory as long as the Syrians are there.

It will soon be a year since the start of Israeli aggression against Lebanon, yet the Tel Aviv occupiers, as we can see, are not even thinking of leaving Lebanese soil. Washington unconditionally supports these piratical actions which are flagrantly at variance with the theory and practice of international law. Indeed, there exist with respect to the Israeli aggression against Lebanon the unanimously adopted UN Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509 which demand the immediate withdrawal of Tel Aviv's occupying troops from Lebanese territory. On the other hand, the Syrians have officially stated and continue to state that they are ready, at the request of the Lebanese authorities who once invited them, to withdraw from that country the Syrian Army subunits belonging to the Pan-Arab Peacekeeping Forces. Naturally they will do this only after the unconditional withdrawal of Israel's occupying troops from Lebanon.

Everything would seem logically correct. However in this case, as perhaps always, logic is at variance with the military strategic plans of the aggressive Washington-Tel Aviv alliance. That is the origin of Tel Aviv's illogical "undertakings" not to withdraw from Lebanon until the Syrian troops are pulled out and the United States' "undertakings" to seek the implementation of this withdrawal at any price. At any price indeed, as Washington's actions recently have shown by failing to take account of the fact that Syria is a sovereign and independent state.

The massive "conditioning" of Syria began immediately after the signing of the Israeli-Lebanese "peace agreement." U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz is tirelessly urging Syria to "be sensible" and leave Lebanon. P. Habib, the U.S. President's envoy, despite the Syrian Government's refusal to receive him, continues to sit in Beirut in the hope that something may change. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger pays a lightning visit to Paris where he meets with his Saudi Arabian counterpart, Prince Sultan, and insists that the kingdom should bring every pressure to bear on the Syrians on the question of troop withdrawal. "The alternatives look very grim," U.S. Assistant Secretary of State N. Veliotes announces ominously. But the Israeli military, of course, are backing up his "idea" by escalating aggressive preparations in East Lebanon.

What are the results of all these efforts? Syrian President H. al-Asad recently reaffirmed the unvarying nature of his country's stance, stressing that the only agreement on the Lebanese question which Syria supports is the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Lebanese territory with no conditions whatever. A Kuwaiti Government spokesman has stated that "any agreement concluded with the enemy and threatening the security of any Arab country encroaches on the rights of the Arab state." Much the same thing is stated in the communique of the conference of foreign ministers of the Persian Gulf Arab countries' Cooperation Council held in the Saudi capital, Riyadh.

This negative attitude on the Arabs' part toward Washington's actions in their region attests unambiguously to their understanding that U.S. Near East policy leads to deadlock not only in resolving the Lebanese problem but also in settling the Near East crisis with its basic issue -- the Palestinian problem. Indeed, sober-minded Americans must also be aware of this. It cannot be considered a normal phenomenon when the policy of a great power in an entire region is built on "faits accomplis" created by its aggressive satellite, or on pushing Tel Aviv to create them.

On each occasion the Arab East becomes increasingly convinced that the path of separate bogus peace deals imposed by Washington and Tel Aviv is a fundamentally wrong path. Not only does it contradict the interests of the Near East peoples, it is a direct threat to world peace and security. What is the sensible alternative? As far as the Lebanese problem is concerned, it is the unconditional fulfillment of UN Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509 and the safeguarding of Lebanon's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence. With regard to the broader question -- an overall Near East settlement which should hinge on the Palestinian problem, there exist the well-known Pan-Arab principles elaborated in Fes and the Soviet proposals which coincide with them in their key elements and which constitute a good basis for talks.

There is also the proposal for the mechanism for conducting such talks -- an international conference with the participation of all interested sides, including the PLO. All this, of course, does not rule out other constructive initiatives. The main thing is to abandon the pernicious policy of confrontation and attempts to resolve the complex problems of the Near East conflict with the aid of military force -- to abandon them in favor of cooperation and the collective quest for paths to a peace settlement. This is now being stated openly even by the leaders of those Arab regimes which Washington considers to be its friends. They know from their own experience that there will be neither peace nor security in the Near East otherwise.

LIBYAN, SOVIET FRIENDSHIP SOCIETIES SIGN AGREEMENT

LD250149 Tripoli JANA in English 1712 GMT 24 May 83

[Text] Tripoli, Shaban 12, 24 May, JAMAHIRIYAH NEWS AGENCY -- The Libyan and Soviet friendship societies signed yesterday in Tripoli an agreement for cultural and social cooperation.

The signing ceremony was signed by the secretary-general of the Libyan Arab-Soviet Friendship Society and secretary of the Green Book Research Centre, Mr Ahmad Shahati, and the chairperson of the Soviet-Libyan Friendship Society and Soviet deputy premier, Mr Vladimir Demchenko.

DEVELOPMENT OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS BY RSA ALLEGED

LD310801 Moscow TASS in English 0642 GMT 31 May 83

[Text] London May 31 TASS -- New data on the dangerous plans of creating the so-called "ethnical" bacteriological weapons in the Republic of South Africa have become known to the public in the course of the meetings held here by the working group of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. The Pretoria regime is hastily developing bacteriological weapons that will affect only Africans, the meeting was told by Gavin Cautry, a white South African who has emigrated from his country because of opposition to the inhuman practice of apartheid. He said that groups of researchers thoroughly selected viruses of diseases that are harmless for whites but lethal for Africans. The new weapons, he said, will be used against the African population of the Republic of South Africa and Namibia, and also during bandit attacks on independent neighboring countries.

U.S. Experts Aiding RSA

LD022121 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 2 Jun 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] U.S. experts are working in laboratories of the Medical Research Institute of the RSA Air Force. They are taking part in the creation of binary chemical shells for the racist regime. This was reported by the Ghana paper THE ECHO. It is known that the S. African military has already used chemical toxins several times against patriots of Namibia and armed forces of Angola and now it comes out that active support in this is being given to the RSA regime by the U.S. Administration. In the state of apartheid research is being conducted into creating so-called ethnic weapons. The principle of their action is based on the natural differences between racial groups. At a top-secret laboratory in the north of the Transvaal, RSA experts are studying the possibility of using for military purposes viruses of diseases practically harmless to whites but lethal to people with a black skin. The RSA rulers are striving to make even their weapons racist.

UN RESOLUTION ON NAMIBIAN INDEPENDENCE ADOPTED

LD011318 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 1 Jun 83

[Text] New York June 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets reports:

The U.N. Security Council has adopted a resolution instructing the U.N. secretary-general to hold consultations with the sides concerned on a ceasefire in Namibia. It is meant that that will create conditions for the earliest transition of that territory, which is illegally occupied by the South-African regime, to independence. The U.N. secretary-general is to submit a report on the results of consultations not later than August 31, this year.

Thus, the U.N. Security Council has virtually expressed distrust of the U.S.-headed Western "Contact Group" which acted as "intermediaries" at talks with the republic of South Africa on the implementation of the U.N. plan for the granting of independence to Namibia under international control. The group's "mediation" boiled down in actual fact to sabotaging the plan and to playing up to the racists.

The U.N. Security Council confirmed the legal responsibility of the United States and first of all of the council itself for the destiny of Namibia, and for the decision on holding free and just elections under the supervision of the world body.

San Nujoma, president of the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), speaking after the voting, warned the USA and its Western partners against new intrigues aimed at dragging out a settlement of the problem of Namibia and at consolidating the racist regime. He expressed satisfaction with the fact that an overwhelming majority of states resolutely rejected the newest trick invented by Washington for the same purpose -- the "linkage" of the emancipation of Namibia with a withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, the troops which are there at the request of Angola's legitimate government. The SWAPO is ready to cooperate with the United Nations in organizing elections in Namibia and to sign a ceasefire agreement, Sam Nujoma emphasized. However, the racist regime, he pointed out, continues to consolidate its hold on Namibia and brings new troops in addition to the 100,000 South African soldiers who are already there.

At the Council meeting, representatives of socialist countries -- Bulgaria, the GDR, and Poland -- stated support for the Namibian people's struggle for liberation. They urged the United Nations to multiply efforts aimed at creating an independent and democratic Namibia.

RSA 'Ignores' Resolution

LD031335 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] New York June 3 TASS -- TASS correspondent V. Vasilets reports:

The Pretoria racist regime still intends brazenly to ignore the will of the international community demanding independence for Namibia which is being occupied by the South African Army. This outrageous stand has been reiterated by South Africa's representative to the United Nations, Kurt Von Schirnding, who has met U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar.

The meeting took place under the mandate received by the secretary general from the Security Council to hold consultations with the interested parties on a proposed cease-fire settlement in Namibia. The meeting has not yielded positive results through the fault of the South African representative. Von Schirnding told journalists after the meeting that South Africa was not going to renounce the "linkage" between the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and the granting of independence to Namibia.

Statements coming in from South Africa and released by its mission here are in the same flagrant and obstructionist tenor. For instance, Pretoria's Foreign Minister Roelof Botha put forward the outrageous demand in the form of an ultimatum that the U.N. secretary general should visit South Africa for consultations only if he agrees to meet in Namibia representatives of local "parties"; in other words, South African puppets in the occupied territory. Political observers at the United Nations believe that Pretoria's brazen stance can be easily explained: The racists are firmly convinced that the Reagan administration, holding South Africa for a "friend" and "ally," will not leave the racists to fend for themselves. Indeed, during debates on the Namibian problem at the latest Security Council meeting the U.S. delegation made it clear that they would veto any resolution if it contained as much as a hint of the introduction of sanctions against Pretoria.

REAGAN SAID 'TOUGHENING' CENTRAL AMERICAN POLICY

LD031617 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 3 Jun 83

["U.S.A. Escalating Interference in Central America" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS - TASS commentator Ruslan Knyazev writes: The U.S. President's special envoy in Central America, Richard Stone, arrived in El Salvador on Thursday on the first leg of his "inspection tour" of the region aimed at coordinating with pro-American reactionary regimes specific measures to combat popular liberation movements in Central American countries.

The first steps undertaken by this Reagan's envoy, mark a new stage in U.S. policy in Central America which is characterised by even wider U.S. interference in the affairs of the region. Personnel changes in the U.S. diplomatic apparatus in recent days, namely the replacement of the special assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs and the U.S. ambassador to El Salvador, are further evidence that the incumbent U.S. President rejects a political settlement in Central America and is toughening his policy for a military settlement of the crisis situation there.

Commenting on the personnel changes today, THE WASHINGTON POST said they were designed to put down common sense in the administration's Latin American policy and pass over the political initiatives to those advocating a tougher line.

It was not by chance that Richard Stone's first meeting with Salvadoran puppets coincided in time with the U.S. Government's decision to send an additional number of servicemen to El Salvador. At the same time, one hundred U.S. "Green Berets", instructors from a special operations force, are arriving in Honduras this month to train 2,500 Salvadoran Junta troops and a hand-picked Honduran Army battalion in punitive operations techniques at a large U.S. base under construction there.

THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, quoting members of the National Security Council, that the government was now considering even further increases in the number of military advisers in El Salvador and in the scope of military links with the Honduran regime, as well as resumption of military aid to the Guatemalan dictatorship.

Seen in the light of these facts, attempts by U.S. officials, including President Reagan himself, at "denying" press reports about increased U.S. interference in Central America are a routine exercise in hypocritical talk. Escalating U.S. military presence in the region is an established fact. Seeking to keep the undemocratic Salvadoran regime, whom Ronald Reagan's predecessor James Carter described as the most criminal government in the Western Hemisphere, and its other puppets in power, Washington is bent on turning Central America into a hotbed of military conflagration, jeopardising world peace.

U.S. LATIN AMERICAN AMBASSADOR SHUFFLE SCORED

LD041321 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Following President Reagan's decision to dismiss Thomas Enders from his post of assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, there has been a report that the American Ambassador at San Salvador, Deane Hinton, is to go too.

Commentary is by Radio Moscow's Maksim Teplov:

Both Enders and Hinton until recently had been kingpins of the United States policy in Central America. The two diplomats (?were) to prevent a further growth in national liberation trends in the region and they are being sacked because apparently they have not succeeded. From the outset the administration has been looking for a military solution in Central America, a solution that would involve the United States. However, the past 2 years have done nothing to make its wish come true. The President and his men made a false step when they tried to present the conflict in El Salvador as being fuelled from the outside and resulting from confrontation between East and West. What's more, they ignored the country's social, economic, and political peculiarities. Accordingly, instead of facing the internal causes of the war in El Salvador, the White House has been trying to fight those Salvadorans who oppose the dictatorship's repressive rule and call for a democratic renewal.

In the past two years Washington has been financing the Salvadoran regime at a rate of $1 million a day, both directly and through international moneylenders. The total has passed $750 million mark. Meanwhile, with the Pentagon's help, the regime's armed forces have increased from 20,000 to 40,000 men to rank among the strongest in Central America. The Salvadoran military are equipped with sophisticated American weapons; American military advisers provide them with training and, what's more, they've been directing their combat operations. Yet the Salvadoran regime has been suffering defeats one after another. It has lost 10 percent of its manpower; defections have been frequent. The turmoil within the officers' corps has caused Defense Minister Garcia to resign. Meanwhile, the country's economic position continues to be grave.

In their more than 20 years with the State Department, Enders and Hinton have built up a true picture of what is going on in El Salvador and the rest of Central America, therefore they can't have failed to call into question the administration's policy toward El Salvador. Enders was considered a hardliner, but as he came to realize that the use of force was producing results and was even undermining his country's international prestige, he tried to modify the American policy in El Salvador. According to the American press, Enders has lately proposed to continue military aid for the regime but at the same time to try negotiating with the National Liberation Front.

As for Hinton, he has made several disparaging statements about El Salvador's legal system and the activities of right-wing extremists. He also suggested concentrating on economic aid rather than military. This set him by the ears with hardliners like the president's national security adviser, William Clark, and the ambassador to the United Nations, Jean Kirkpatrick, whos object to the very idea of negotiating with the National Liberation Front and believe America needs a military victory in El Salvador.

The dismissal of Enders and Hinton is a logical result of the bitter struggle going on within the Republican administration over whether or not to look for political solutions to Central America's problems and international disputes in general. So far the advocates of the policy from the position of strength have prevailed. They call for increased American interference in the affairs of other countries. It's widely believed that President Reagan has decided to harden his line in Central America and make a stake on military force. This being so, the two diplomats, Thomas Enders and Deane Hinton, may have fallen victim to yet another adventure, this time in Central America.

IZVESTIYA BERATES GOLDWATER'S CUBAN REMARKS

PM031037 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 83 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Ganshin "Telegram With Commentary": "A Longing for the Past"]

[Text] As a UPI correspondent recently reportly from Washington, Senator B. Goldwater has appeared on an American television channel in the "Face the Nation" program. He stated, in particular, that "he will not object to an American invasion of Cuba if the Fidel Castro government does not halt the campaign of 'Cubanization' of the Western Hemisphere."

On the whole, Goldwater thinks that the United States "should have carried out an invasion of Cuba earlier." Had that happened, the senator imagines that the United States would have been able "to keep" Central America for itself and would have "spared itself fresh troubles."

Really, Mr Goldwater?! The liberation movement in the Latin American countries is gathering strength, and this objective process is growing daily despite the fierce opposition of the United States and its military and financial aid to antipopular dictatorial regimes -- precisely the same way that in their time the specially trained bands of cutthroats in Vietname and North Korea were unable to help the Americans when the peoples of those countries rose in defense of their sovereignty and national dignity. However, a longing for the past gives Goldwater no peace. As he sees it, "if we had been prepared to allow our soldiers to use all the forces we had in Vietnam, we could have won there."

What came of those adventures is well known. America has taken a long time to come to its senses following the shock caused by "dirty wars." And, if you recall, they have already tried to speak with the Island of Freedom in a loud commanding voice. Nothing came of it. Nor will it in the future either, and it is about time that certain hotheads in the United States appreciated that it is impossible to defeat a people which has taken up arms in order to change its life for the better.

U.S. TO SEND GREEN BERETS TO HONDURAS

LD032145 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Approximately 100 American Green Berets are to be sent to Honduras in the next 2 weeks, according to an announcement made by the U.S. Army Department. NBC television reported that they are to go to the northern coastal region of Honduras where American military advisers are planning to create one of the largest bases in Central America for training military personnel. According to NBC, up to 2,500 Salvadoran soldiers and officers will undergo training there. This base is situated approximately 100 miles from the location of heavy fighting between Salvadoran rebels and the troops of the reactionary regime.

BRIEFS

CUBAN DELEGATION -- A delegation from the Cuban National Assembly, led by Flavio Bravo Pardo, president of the assembly, paid a visit to Riga from 3 to 5 June. The members of the delegation had talks with Comrade Strautmanis, Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 5 Jun 83 LD]

KIRGHIZ SUPREME SOVIET PROCEEDINGS REPORTED

PM292056 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 21 May 83 p 1

[KIRTAG "Information Report on Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet Sittings"]

[Text] The Eighth Session of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet, 10th Convocation was held in the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and the Kirghiz SSR Council of Ministers Hall of Sessions 20 May 1983.

It was 1000 hours. Members of the Kirghiz CP Central Committee Bureau T.U. Usubaliyev, A. Duysheyev, A. Dzhumagulov, K.N. Kulmatov, P.I. Naumov, P.M. Khodos, N.G. Minich, and N.P. Lomov; Candidate Members of the Kirghiz CP Central Committee Bureau Dzh.Ch. Tashibekova, E. Abakirov, and V.K. Mdolmatov; members of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the republic's government took their seats in the government boxes.

Deputy T. Askarov, chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet, presiding, declared the session open.

After the credentials commission report delivered by its chairman, Deputy M.S. Sydykov, the Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution on recognizing the mandates of Deputies V.M. Alymov, elected for Nekrasovskiy Electoral Okrug No 9, Dzh. Turdubayev, elected for Novo-Voznesenovskiy Electoral Okrug No 155, and O. Abdykalykov, elected for Pervomayskiy Electoral Okrug No 299.

The deputies unanimously approved the session's agenda.

1. The tasks of the republic's soviets in strengthening labor and state discipline and public order in the light of the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum decisions.

2. The Kirghiz SSR Draft Housing Code.

3. The work of the Kirghiz SSR People's Control Committee.

4. Ratification of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decrees.

The deputies then proceeded to examine the items on the agenda.

Deputy A. Duysheyev, chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Council of Ministers, was given the floor to deliver the report "On the Tasks of the Republic's Soviets in Strengthening Labor and State Discipline and Public Order in the Light of the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum Decisions."

Taking part in the debate on the report were Deputies A. Tadzhibayev (Uch-Terekskiy Electoral Okrug No 330); A.K. Orozbayev, (Yaroslavskiy Electoral Okrug No 14); and K. Myrzabekov (Dzhany-Arykskiy Electoral Okrug No 192); I.V. Khmelevskoy, chairman of Poltavskiy Rural Soviet Ispolkom, Kalininskiy Rayon; Deputies E.E. Aliyev (Kara-Alminskiy Electoral Okrug No 324); A.K. Kenesariyev (Ivanovskiy Electoral Okrug No 62); Dzh. Tynayev (Orgochorskiy Electoral Okrug No 160); V.V. Loshakov (Frunzenskiy Electoral Okrug No 347); E. Abakirov (Bosterinskiy Electoral Okrug No 166); I.P. Kondrashov (Gulchinskiy Electoral Okrug No 250); N.Ya. Pristavkin (Typuskiy Electoral Okrug No 178) Dzh. Akmatov (Shkolnyy Electoral Okrug No 223); and K.B. Khuriyev (Stroitelnyy Electoral Okrug No 225).

The debate on the first item on the agenda continued at the afternoon sitting of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet.

Those who spoke in the debate were deputies M.V. Yendovitskiy (Kurenkeyevskiy Electoral Okrug No 39); M.V. Ott (Bark-Arykskiy Electoral Okrug No 94); and K.A. Orozaliyev (Ilichevskiy Electoral Okrug No 340)

The Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet unanimously adopted the resolution "On the Tasks of the Republic's Soviets in Strengthening Labor and State Discipline and Public Order in the Light of the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum Decisions."

The session then moved on to the examination of the next item on the agenda. A report "On the Kirghiz SSR Draft Housing Code" was delivered by Deputy S.G. Moiseyev, deputy chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Council of Ministers.

A coreport by the Kirghiz SSR Legislative Proposals Commission and the Housing, Municipal Economy, and Consumer Services Commission was delivered by Deputy A.K. Sultanov, chairman of the Legislative Proposals Commission.

The following deputies took part in the debate on the Kirghiz SSR Draft Housing Code -- A. Mokenov (Kyzyl-Ordinskiy Electoral Okrug No 12); I. Kulmatov, (Stroitelnyy Electoral Okrug No 216); L.N. Ilyushchenko (Przhevalskiy Electoral Okrug No 145); and Ye.G. Pisarskiy (Politekhnicheskiy Electoral Okrug No 35)

A law on the ratification of the Kirghiz SSR Housing code was passed unanimously.

The deputies then heard a report "On the Work of the Kirghiz SSR People's Control Committee," delivered by Deputy N.G. Minich, chairman of the republic People's Control Committee.

The following deputies spoke in the debate: V.K. Kandakov (Lenin-Dzholskiy Electoral Okrug No 289); T.M. Nurambetova (Alma-Atinskiy Electoral Okrug No 46); and A. Mamyrov, (Torkentskiy Electoral Okrug No 326).

The session unanimously adopted a resolution "On the Work of the Kirghiz SSR People's Control Committee."

Deputy S. Omurkulova, secretary of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, delivered a report on the ratification of Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees.

The Supreme Soviet ratified the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees and adopted corresponding laws and resolutions.

With that the Eighth Session of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet, 10th Convocation, ended its work.

BRIEFS

TURKMENISTAN RESTORATION WORK -- The tallest minaret in Central Asia, that is to say the 62-meter-tall minaret in Turkmenistan's historic (Kohneurgen) city, is being repaired. Expert workers on the job are endeavoring to complete the work of this rare 14th century edifice. Meanwhile, (Kohneurgen) has many more historic monuments. A number of them, including a 14th century tomb, have been restored. [Text] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 31 May 83 GF]

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY MINISTER RESPONDS TO CRITICISM

PM271123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 May 83 First Edition p 2

[Article by Minister of the Chemical Industry V. Listov under the rubric "Following a PRAVDA Article":"'The Fifteenth Adjustment'"]

[Text] The materials set out in the article "The Fifteenth Adjustment" published in PRAVDA on 16 March this year have been examined at a session of the Ministry of the Chemical Inudstry collegium. The criticism of the Ministry of the Chemical Industry was acknowledged to be quite correct.

The Ministry Collegium sharply condemned the instances of adjustments to quarterly and yearly plans. It severely censured V. Semenov, chief of the All-Union Soyuzkhimvolokno Industrial Association, and V. Karmanskiy, chief of the Material and Technical Supply Administration, for failing to take the requisite measures to ensure the normal working of the Sokol Chemical Fiber Plant.

In recent years, in fact, the plant has not been supplied with the requisite quantities of raw materials, mainly caustic soda, which has led to production stoppages and nonfulfillment of plan indicators.

For 1983 the Sokal plant has been allocated funds to purchase the basic types of raw materials directly from suppliers, and the creation of the necessary industrial caustic soda reserve has also been envisaged. The plant has fulfilled the plan for the past months of the year in terms of all technical and economic indicators, and the enterpris is working steadily at present, too.

To stabilize cadres at the plant, it is envisaged that in 1984 the construction will begin of an apartment house containing 90 apartments, as well as of an apartment house built using the resources of the housing construction cooperative. The construction of a kindergarten for 320 children will begin.

The ministry has provided for the allocation of extra facilities for mechanizing loading and unloading work, of metalworking machine tools, and of motor transport.

The attention of leaders of all-union industrial associations and functional administrations was drawn to the need to be more attentive and timely in their examination of questions and requests from leaders of enterprises and to take appropriate measures not only at ministry apparatus level but also directly at grassroots level.

A team comprising V. Smirnov, deputy minister of the Chemical Industry, and experts from the USSR Gosplan, the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, Main Administration of Chemical Production and Soyuzkhimvolokno was sent to the Sokal Chemical Fiber Plant to provide practical work assistance. Executives of the CPSU Central Committee, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and the Lvov Ukrainian CP Obkom took part in an examination of questions of the plant collective's work.

The team members examined questions of the collective's socioeconomic development in the workshops and sections and delivered a report on the planned measures to a conference of the plant aktiv. The ministry has set up a system to monitor the fulfillment of the planned measures.

However, the overall provision of the chemical fiber industry enterprises with various types of raw materials remains complex.

The ministry has still not managed to set up normal industrial reserves of basic types of raw materials, and many enterprises are working "from hand to mouth." At present a number of caustic soda-producing plants are working unsatisfactorily. The ministry has laid down further special measures to stabilize the work of Chlorine Industry Association enterprises and is monitoring their fulfillment. There are still difficulties with ensuring the production of chemical fibers from cord cellulose, ethylene glycol, and cellulose acetates.

The Ministry of the Chemical Industry is taking measures to overcome the prevailing difficulties in the supply of raw materials on both its own products list and that of the USSR Gosplan, the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, and other departments.

CIVIL AVIATION CONFERENCE HELD IN ALMA-ATA

PM251342 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 May 83 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Airmen Convene"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 24 May -- Our country is firmly sustaining its position as world leader in the use of aircraft and helicopters in the national economy. In our day it is hard to imagine a large construction site or broad-scale geological prospecting without aircraft. The agricultural aviation service pilots make a substantial contribution to the solution of the Food Program: this year about 100 million hectares of land will be treated from the air.

Problems of further enhancing the efficiency of the use of aircraft and helicopters in the national economy were the focus of attention of an all-union conference of leading production workers of the Ministry of Civil Aviation held in Alma-Ata today.

The conference discussed measures to improve the quality of operation of civil aircraft in the light of the demands of the 26th CPSU Congress and the fullest satisfaction of the national economy sectors' needs for aviation services.

TV TOWER 380 M HIGH ERECTED IN TASHKENT

PM261020 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 May 83 p 1

[Report from "Around the Motherland" roundup of own and TASS correspondent reports: "Installation Completed"]

[Text] Tashkent [no date given] -- A red flag raised over the Uzbek capital at a height of 380 meters was how workers announced the completion of the installation of the shell of Central Asia's tallest television tower.

The main workfront has moved to the technical building, where the work of finishing the premises is in full swing.

Radio installation workers have been drafted in from Moscow. They have made a start on the installation of television transmitters.

HARVESTING CONDITIONS, OPERATIONS REVIEWED

PM031509 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Jun 83 First Edition p 1

[V. Istomin "Agricultural Review": "Care for the Harvest"]

[Text] During the passage from spring to summer many types of jobs coincide in the country's vast fields. In the far south the grain harvest has started, in many regions the sowing is still continuing. The month of May, drawing to a close, has put farmers here to a difficult test. In Karaganda Oblast, for instance, snow fell on Tuesday for the third time in the current sowing season. Specialists were forced to introduce changes in crop cultivation techniques and to take steps to "thaw out" the top layer of the soil. The seed quota has been increased on farms -- denser sowings mature quicker. In order to reduce the wheat vegetation period, increased doses of phosphate fertilizer are being introduced into the drills together with the seeds.

A powerful cyclone has made sowing progress more difficult in Kazakhstan's Virgin Lands, too. It was necessary to reinforce sowing units with machine operators from cities and rayon centers at short notice. And in North Kazakhstan, Kustanay and Kokchetav Oblasts, farms have carried out the sowing within the periods specified by the work schedule. Only in Tselinograd Oblast did bad weather delay somewhat the conclusion of the sowing campaign, but even there practically only feed graincrops remain to be sown and the displacement of their schedule to June presents no danger. Especially since a good moisture supply guarantees the rapid development of plants.

Wheat sowing is drawing to a close in Krasnoyarsk Kray, Novosibirsk Oblast and the Altay. The situation is complex on the soybean farms in Khabarovsk Kray and Amur Oblast. There the best time indicated by agricultural specialists for sowing this valuable crop is coming to an end, and so far 19,900 and 140,300 hectares, respectively, are occupied -- not much more than one-third of the area allocated under the plan. It is very important now to focus all efforts on completing this work, on filling every hour with highly productive labor. The Far East must live up to its reputation as the country's main soybean growing region.

Judging by the RSFSR Central Statistical Administration report, soybeans had been sown on 256,000 hectares -- or 43 percent of the plan -- in the Far Eastern region by 30 May. Spring crops there occupy a total of 63 percent of the allocated area. The picture is similar in the East Siberian and West Siberian regions. According to the USSR Central Statistical Administration, spring crops occupy 130.3 million hectares in the country as a whole; millet has been sown on 2.44 million hectares (93 percent), and buckwheat on 1.13 million hectares (67 percent).

With the coming of summer, new chores have emerged for the farmers. The tending of sowings has spread even to northern and northeastern regions of the Nonchernozem. So, in Perm Oblast pregermination and postgermination harrowing of row crops is underway, and in Smolensk and other flax-growing oblasts chemical weed eradication is in full swing on the flax fields. In Bryansk Oblast, which has the Russian Federation's biggest "second bread" field, the potato-growers in Klimovskiy, Bryanskiy and Suzemskiy Rayons are setting an example. They had completed the first "blind" tending of the fields right at the beginning of the past 10-day period and are now banking up the plants. In the country as a whole, the first interrow cultivation of potatoes has been carried out on four-fifths of the fields.

It is a busy time in the fields of Belorussia. Two weeks earlier than usual, they have now started cutting grass there and many machine operators have been diverted to this work.

Nevertheless, links and teams are simultaneously tending the sowings in good time and to a high standard. Gomel potato-growers are actively combatting the Colorado beetle and the graingrowers are not forgetting about augmenting the harvest. On Brest farms, in particular, spring graincrops have been treated with weedkiller and this work was carried out quickly and with good results. In Mogilev Oblast, great care is being devoted to clover seed plants; in Bobruyskiy Rayon, cropping of the clover plants during the bud-formation stage -- an indispensable agricultural technique for obtaining a big harvest -- has already been carried out. Work in tending sugar beets is reaching its peak -- the plants have been thinned out on 3 million hectares, or 85 percent of the sowings. In the Kuban the rows of sugar beets are already closing up and on one-third of the fields top-dressing and banking up of the root crops has been carried out. In the Central Chernozem Region they are pushing ahead with thinning out the sugar beet sowings. Industrial workers and employees from cities and settlements and retired people are helping in the fields there. There is only one objective: to build up hefty yields.

Cottongrowers in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, where the situation has been complicated lately by squally winds and heavy downpours, are pursuing the same aim. It has been necessary to resow cotton on part of the fields and to step up efforts in tending it.

The weather is dry in many regions of the European part of the country and artificial rain can often be heard falling on the fields. According to operation data, graincrops, including corn, have been irrigated for the third time on 545,000 hectares. Nevertheless, reserves do exist, by no means all equipment is in use and part of the irrigation units is not used rationally. The fields must be supplied with water wherever possible. The harvest will repay a hundredfold all care that has been devoted to it.

IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL ON HARVEST PREPARATIONS

PM031056 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 83 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Harvest is Approaching"]

[Excerpt] We are waiting for this year's harvest with hope and excitement. The last 3 years were very difficult, the elements kept wiping out the great, selfless labor of the farmers who were filled with the desire to complete the 10th 5-year plan in shock fashion and to make a successful start to the 11th 5-year Plan. But the difficulties did not discourage people, they only made them work even harder and in more concentrated fashion in the third year of the 5-year plan. The farmers nursed weak winter crops on millions of hectares and prepared themselves better than in past years for the sowing campaign and on the whole carried it out well. And now ears are forming on the graincrops in the southern grain-growing regions. Soon the machine operators will drive out into the fields!

Harvest work schedules have been drawn up or are being drawn up on kolkhozes and sovkhozes. This has been done for a long time. However, the current schedules have a distinctive feature. The new management organs -- the agro-industrial associations -- and local soviets are directing farms to make the best possible use during the harvest of the already accumulated material and technical potential. This potential is considerable -- simply unprecedented. In particular it has increased during the past few years when the party and government channeled unusually large sums into the development of agriculture and the agro-industrial complex sectors. Suffice it to recall that the entire kolkhoz and sovkhoz machine and tractor pool has been essentially renewed during the past 8 years.

Unfortunately, it cannot be said that the quality of the utilization of the machinery has improved at the same rate.

Traditional harvesting periods have not been shortened greatly and combine productivity is increasing slowly despite the fact that a new generation of the "ships of the steppes" has gone into action everywhere during the past few years. Experts and scientists believe that the current machine-labor ratio makes it feasible to complete the harvest in 12-15 working days almost everywhere. And speaking about a specific crop, say winter wheat, in 8-10 days. After all, it does not happen even on a single farm that all fields ripen at the same time. That is not even desirable -- the combines would choke. In short, nature determines the dates. However, when the harvest in some places lasts up to a month, even given normal weather, then the reason no longer lies with nature but with bad organization, a low level of machine readiness and weak harvest backup facilities.

The main thing now, of course, is the state of the machinery. The readiness of tractors and trucks can and must be higher. And although these machines are in operation all year round and, naturally, require preventive maintenance and small repairs, it is inadmissible that in a number of rayons, year after year, farms start the harvest with 10 or more percent of tractors out of action. There is no serious reason whatsoever now not to overhaul all 100 percent of the combines, harvesters, mowers and tractor rakes. That is to say, those machines and implements which are basically in use during 1 month in the year. And the remaining 11 months are quite sufficient to put them in first class condition.

This is where a psychological block comes into play: it has always been like that, they say. It has been, but now it must stop! -- keen masters, farsighted leaders and many local soviets are urging this. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo has drawn the attention of the State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture and of a number of other departments to the need to step up the preparation of high-power tractors. The situation has improved. Evidently, by making the necessary efforts it is possible to achieve the complete readiness of combines, harvesters and mowers.

At the same time on farms, too, it is important to show more initiative in the preparations for the harvest. All available machinery must be carefully adjusted and sealed, on every farm all the very simple measures which make it possible to avoid losses of grain and feed must be carried out. The agro-industrial associations and local soviets are called upon to oversee this work. All the more so since it does not require any major expenditure and produces visible results.

What complicates the harvest in many parts of the country? Above all the fact that at that time several jobs in the fields happen to coincide. There is the harvest, feed procurement, and the tending of row crops and vegetable plantations -- all at the same time. After all, the struggle for yields is underway everywhere, and there is no secondary sector whose interests could be sacrificed for the sake of, say, the grain harvest. Hundreds of units of various types of machinery are in use simultaneously on every farm. And in every rayon there are thousands of them. For this reason the harvest nowadays demands, of course, very careful organization and the flexible management of the work in hand. The operational headquarters, traditionally set up in rayons and oblasts, have not always coped with this task. Many confined themselves to controlling the transport, pooling information and, why not admit it, dressing down farm leaders. It is hoped that the agro-industrial associations will succeed during this year's harvest in qualitatively changing the nature of this work.

In particular they must pay close attention to the detachment operating the collective contract. There will be many more of them than in past years during this harvest. And as is known, in the past the contract collectives frequently got into difficult situations particularly during the harvest: their labor frequently became depersonalized, some of the machinery they needed was taken away from them, and it even happened that machine operators were, for a time, dispersed to other detachments altogether.

In the final analysis, it was the end result that suffered, the aim toward which they had been working for a year, and confidence in the contract was undermined. This must not be tolerated. Local soviets, too, are called upon to participate with ardor in the work of the contract collectives.

It can be said that the farmers' closest partners in the harvest are the procurement workers. The material and technical facilities of the USSR Ministry of Procurement are being strengthened with every year. The department has every possibility to organize the reception of grain in an exemplary fashion. In this work it is very important that procurement workers display interest and concern for the quality of wheat, groats and other crops. Railroad and river transport workers must work out the tactics for their operations most thoroughly.

Farmers must tackle the harvest confidently. During the past five months the farms have received practically everything that industry was to deliver according to the plan. Recently the government has adopted the resolution "On Additional Measures To Safeguard the Harvest, the Procurement of Agricultural Products and Feed in 1983, and the Successful Wintering of Livestock in 1983-84." It envisages intensified state assistance to farmers during the crucial period and weighty material incentives. All conditions are being created for the harvest and procurement of feed to be carried out to a high organizational and technological standard.

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY NEEDS SERVICING, SPARES

LD270603 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Today a meeting of the all-union operations headquarters for material and technical supplies to rural areas is being held at the USSR State Committee for material and Technical Supply. Attention is being concentrated on preparations for mass harvesting work. It was noted that this year the repair of combines, grain cleaning machinery and other harvesting equipment has been organized considerably better than a year ago. But there is still a very great deal of work to be done. Over 100,000 grain-harvesting combines, tens of thousands of reapers and feed harvesting and cotton combines need to be prepared for work in the fields. It was stressed that the collectives of industrial enterprises have considerably improved the delivery of new equipment and spare parts. The supply of railroad frieghtcars to carry finished products for rural areas has become more organized.

However, tractors, harvesting machinery and other equipment needed for agricultural work have still not left many plants and depots belonging to the State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture. Individual collectives of the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production, and other industrial ministries are not coping with the plan for the output of products. The acute shortage of certain components is holding up equipment overhauls and hindering the more efficient equipment use. Enterprises like the Tula and Krasnoyarsk Combine Plants, the Kharkov Tractor Engines Plant, and the Lyubertsy Ukhtomskiy Works were named. The supply of spare parts from all enterprises belonging to the Ministry of the Automotive Industry has deteriorated this year. The collective of the Yaroslavl Avtodizel Association has let rural mechanizers down particularly badly. It is behind the supply of spare parts for K-700 tractors and heavy trucks.

The headquarters is immediately taking speedy steps in response to all critical remarks. Leaders of all ministries and departments providing supplies for agriculture are present at the meeting.

MOSCOW TV ON RURAL MANAGEMENT, NATURE PROTECTION

OW011049 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 28 May carries the "Man, Master on the Land" program presented by IZVESTIYA observer A.Z. Ivashchenko.

Ivashchenko opens the program by noting that a year has passed since the Food Program was adopted by the CPSU Central Committee. He says: "As you know, it is a purposeful and long-range program; however, the first steps in its realization had to be made in fairly difficult circumstances. Nonetheless, as noted at the party central committee conference on 18 April, many oblasts, krays, and republics have achieved yields of grain and recorded good harvests of cotton, vegetables and grapes while the production of milk and eggs has increased. Subsidiary agricultural farms of industrial enterprises are gaining slowly but surely, and concern for the development of personal subsidiary farms of sovkhoz and kolkhoz workers is also having an effect.

"At the conference it was noted that, first of all, stable land cultivation must be ensured and its productivity must be increased considerably. It has been proved through science and practice that to achieve abundant harvests it is essential to change to zonal farming systems. A thrifty attitude to the land by rural workers must be fostered. Presently work on reconstruction of the agricultural management system is continuing throughout the country. Since the beginning of this year we have had 3,154 rayon agro-industrial associations in operation. As far as autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts are concerned, 156 republic, krays and oblast agro-industrial associations have been established.

"It is also heartening that during this period various trusts and all kinds of industrial associations [proms], about which so much was recently written and which failed to prove themselves, were abolished. As a result it became possible, if we take the entire country, to reorganize more than 3,000 trusts and associations and other administrative bodies during this period.

"Here is just one example of what this has produced. Let us take Kurgan Oblast. Here, as a result of a restructuring of the administrative apparatus, 718 specialists were released. This spring these people met directly in kolkhozes and sovkhozes or in other organizations of the agro-industrial complex."

Ivashchenko goes on to discuss problems faced by agriculture this spring due to the increased volume of work. He attributes the increase to last year's extremely dry spring which precluded sowing operations on a 3.5-million hectare area.

The program goes on to show several films highlighting the problem of dust storms in Rostov Oblast which were particularly severe in 1969 in an area known as the Armavir Dust Corridor, new developments in plowing techniques that have revolutionized age-old ideas of deep plowing, problems of wind and water erosion and ways to combat them, and the threat of, and work being done to overcome, the encroachment of deserts. Video scenes alternate between devastation and lush fields and model farms where various agricultural experiments are being conducted. Ivashchenko appears intermittently and stresses man's role in both the destruction and conservation of the environment.

The program concludes with Ivashchenko noting that nature will be bountiful to us if we generous to it.